

DEBACLE IN KASHMIR

HARI OM

The situation in the strategic Jammu and Kashmir, bordering China and Pakistan, has assumed alarming proportions. While the volatile Kashmir is gripped by separatist sentiments, Jammu is sitting on a volcano of discontent, convinced that only separate statehood can end its neglect. The Ladakhi Buddhists Association, on the other extreme, is up in revolt against Kashmir, clamouring for a Union Territory status for Ladakh to overcome the threat to the identity of its people. What has brought the Jammu and Kashmir State to such a critical pass? What has created such a volcanic situation in the State? This is the issue the volume in hand seeks to deal with. The volume, in addition, embodies certain suggestions based on the traumatic experiences spreading over seven decades. These suggestions, if accepted, would go a long way in tackling the serious issues afflicting this unfortunate state.

WOMEN'S COLLEGE
M. A. Rose, Secretary
General Library Room
Acc. No. --- DU ---

DEBACLE IN KASHMIR

Debacle in Kashmir

HARI OM

M.A., Ph.D.

Reader in History

University of Jammu, Jammu

28854

Anmol Publications

ANMOL PUBLICATIONS
4378/4B, Ansari Road,
Daryaganj, New Delhi-110002

954.913
01D

© 1992, Author

PRINTED IN INDIA

Published by Jay Kay Book House, Jammu-Tawi and
Distributed by Anmol Publications, New Delhi and
Printed at Renu Printers, Maujpur, Delhi-53

Preface

Much has been written on Kashmir and the unprecedented secessionist movement it is undergoing. Highly disturbed by a grave threat the disturbances in the Valley have been posing to the unity integrity and sovereignty of India, many a sophisticated journalist, writer and well-meaning person worked hard to analyse the genesis of the Debacle in Kashmir and suggested possible solutions to tackle the serious situation the terrorists and the subversives have created by attacking the very roots of secularism and democracy. Certain top-ranking defence personnels (retired) also made their valuable opinion on the Kashmir crisis public through their analytical writings. The prominent among those who devoted their precious time and energy to examine the factors responsible for the on going "freedom movement" in the Valley include Prof. Balraj Madhok, B. Krishana, Col. J.K. Dutt, Dr. Karan Singh, A.G. Noorani and Brig. Rai Singh. The latest to join them was O.N. Dhar.

While some of the writings appear objective, the others seem somewhat subjective, reflecting the predilections of the authors as also a tendency of ignoring the hard realities in Jammu and Kashmir. Sharp contradictions in some of the writings clearly indicate the authors, hazy perception of the Kashmir tangle. And in the absence of a clear perception formed by objectivity, the exercises in finding out a national and rational solution to the tangle have hardly proved of any use. One of the glaring drawbacks from which most of the writings seem to suffer is the absence of any reference to the sharp and fundamental contradictions which exist between Jammu and Kashmir and between the latter and Ladakh.

To arrive at some logical conclusion one has to evaluate methodically, dispassionately and objectively all the political events that occurred in Jammu and Kashmir between October 1947 and December 1990 as also their impact on the politics of Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh. It should be borne in mind that the seeds of separation, subversion, anti-India politics and inter-regional rancour, acrimony and animosity were sown right in 1947, if not earlier.

The ground for what is happening today in the State was prepared between October 1947 and July 1952. While in 1947 the question of the State's accession to the Indian Dominion was mishandled, in 1948 the Congress Government headed by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru referred the Kashmir issue to the United Nations making Pakistan a party to the self-created dispute. And this faux pas he committed not on his own, but under the subtle but sure influence of Lord Mountbatten, the nominated Governor-General of Independent India. The story of blunders did not end here. To make matters worse for India, Pandit Nehru ordered an uncalled for ceasefire to end the first Indo-Pak War of 1947-48; detached Jammu and Kashmir from the Union Home Ministry and attached it with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs which he himself handled; incorporated the separatist Article 370 in the Indian constitution, thus encouraging the people of Kashmir to remain out of the national mainstream and allowed Srinagar alone to rule over Jammu and Ladakh unmindful of the glaring contradictions that existed between Kashmiris and Jammuites/Ladakhis. To further aggravate the situation, Pandit Nehru not only promised a plebiscite in Kashmir but also entered into negotiations with Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah to strike a deal with the Kashmiris, ignoring the aspirations of the people of Jammu and Ladakh. The negotiations culminated into what is known as the Delhi Agreement of 1952 which accepted the Sheikh's demand for limited accession of the State to the Indian Union. The policy of Indira Gandhi and Rajiv Gandhi was no different.

Any study which does not include Jammu and Ladakh in

its broad framework and does not assess the impact of inter-regional relations on the over all situation would remain incomplete, helping in no way to solve the Kashmir imbroglio. Indeed, any such study would create more problems than it would solve.

The political literature on Kashmir has by and large failed to do full justice to the subject of national importance as it has either ignored the hard realities by depicting the separatist movement in the Valley as a mere child of Pakistan or allowed the biased opinions of the authors to dominate their judgement. Likewise, most of the recent works on Kashmir have failed in giving an objective account of the genesis of the Kashmir imbroglio. Based on the perceptions of faulty fixations, M. J. Akbar's *Kashmir behind the Vale* is one such work.

An objective analysis of the Debacle in Kashmir would reveal that volcanic situation this unfortunate State is facing is not simply the creation of Pakistan as is asserted by all, but also of the grave follies the Congress-National Conference combine committed from time to time. There is, therefore, the need of looking into the role of the Congress-National Conference leaders and to bring to light boldly its baneful contributions to the Indian politics. The present work is an attempt in that direction. Since the volume is a compilation of my articles on Jammu and Kashmir, one may come across some repetitions here and there and a few very minor variations in the statistical data used to highlight the extent of discrimination against Jammu and Ladakh.

The volume contains seven chapters and sixteen Appendices. In the first chapter the nature of the Kashmiri leadership and its attitude towards the Treaty of Amritsar (1846) and the British, the Dogra rulers and Jammu and the Hindus of Jammu and the Pandits of Kashmir have been discussed in detail. Mention has also been made of the demands of the Kashmiri leadership—demands which were purely regional and communal—as also the impact those demands had on the State politics.

Chapter second deals with the opinions expressed by the Congress, the Bhartiya Janta Party, the Janta Dal, the Communist Parties, the National Conference, the erstwhile Insaf Party, the Bhartiya Jana Sangh, Arun Shourie, Girilal Jain, A. P. Venketeshran and Dr. Rahi Masoom Raza. The chapter reveals how sharp is the difference over the genesis of and solution to the ongoing upsurge in Kashmir for 'Azadi'.

In the third chapter an attempt has been made to analyse the circumstances leading to the Debacle in Kashmir. It covers a period of over four decades (1947-90). Dealing with the role Pandit Nehru, Indira Gandhi, Rajiv Gandhi, Sheikh Abdullah, Farooq Abdullah and G. M. Shah played, the chapter describes how each one of these six leaders aggravated the situation in the very name of secularism and democracy and denied Jammu and Ladakh their rightful share in the politics of the State.

In chapters four, five and six are discussed in detail the policies New Delhi and Srinagar evolved that rendered the people of Jammu and Ladakh ineffective for all practical purposes. Herein is also delineated in detail the discriminatory policy the Kashmir-based National Conference/State Congress leadership pursued which relegated the people of Jammu and Ladakh to a humiliating position of insignificance.

Chapter seven has been devoted to the circumstances leading to a remarkable unity between the Bhartiya Janta Party (BJP) and the Ladakhi Buddhists Association (LBA) of the trans-Himalayan Ladakh. Herein is discussed what the BJP-LBA combine stands for and how it views New Delhi's attitude and policy towards Kashmir.

The present work deals not only with the genesis of the fiasco in Kashmir or Jammu's degeneration in all walks of life or the Ladakh impasse but also suggests some solutions to the issues afflicting all the three regions of the State. The solutions, if tried, would certainly go a long way in salvaging the situation in this most unfortunate State.

The tragedy about writing on Kashmir has been that it has been fashionable not to tell the whole truth in the name of the sacred cows-the misconceived national interests. The irony is that these very national interests have been the casualties as a consequence of this approach. Facts have been suppressed and realities ignored under the force of such perception. The author has dared to call a spade a spade, spurred by the love for facts and inspired by the fact that come what may, truth must prevail. No analysis can be correct by beating about the bush. No conclusions can be faithful if adulterated by expediency. The writer's eye must hit the nail squarely without fear or favour. The author has been moved by such motivations in dealing with the tangled skein, the Kashmir imbroglio. At the back of the author's inspiration are prof. A C. Bose and Prof. M.L. Kapur, my teachers and former Heads of Jammu University's History Department, Dr. D.K. Rampal, Professor of English in Jammu University, Radha Kishan Sharma, a former General Manager, Ranbir Government Press, Jammu, and Om Saraf, veteran journalist and an Ex-MLC, to whom I express my deep gratitude.

I am indebted to my wife, Smt. Shashi Gupta, without whose unstinted and unqualified co-operation this work would not have been done.

Jammu

Hari Om

Contents

<i>Preface</i>	v
----------------	---

1. Kashmir Leadership	1
2. Conflicting Perceptions	25
3. The Fiasco	44
4. Jammu Tangle	114
5. Gajendragadkar Perception	129
6. The Plot	160
7. BJP-LBA Unity	169

Appendices

I. Kashmir Settlement : Jammu also has a say	183
II. State of Jammu : Alienated from the Valley	186
III. Kashmir and Human Rights Champions	191
IV. Kashmir Crisis : Hard Facts and Suggestions	194
V. Champions of Human Rights	200
VI. Debacle in Kashmir	204
VII. Jammu and Kashmir : Politically Naive but Deadly Dangerous Initiatives	210
VIII. Jammu And Kashmir : Politico-Constitutional Status	217
IX. Ladakh Signals : A Catastrophe	221
X. President's Jammu Visit : Diabolical Congress (I)—NC Game Exposed	225
XI. Jammu Identity, Autonomy and Statehood	232

XII. Debate on Jammu Statehood	239
XIII. Jammu's Identity, Autonomy And Statehood	245
XIV. Forgotten Facts of Kashmir Scenario	252
XV. SOZ Castigates Jagmohan	260
XVI. "Trifurcate India"	265

Kashmir Leadership

It is generally believed that an extreme form of tension between Jammu and Kashmir regions developed in 1931 after the two most unfortunate incidents of "Tauhin-i-Quran" (insult to the Holy Quran) and the "Reading of Khutba." Both these incidents took place in Jammu and in both the cases involvement of the Hindus was alleged. It is also widely believed that the noble motives which prompted Muslim graduates, including Sheikh Mohd Abdullah, to form Muslim Conference/National Conference were the feudalistic character of Hari Singh's rule (1925-47) responsible for an alleged extreme form of exploitation of the Muslims of Kashmir and the desire to mobilize public opinion to put pressure on the rulers to introduce reforms leading upto the establishment of responsible government.

These beliefs are only partly true. It is, however, true that the year 1931 saw a remarkable unity among Kashmiri Muslims inspired by Sheikh Abdullah against the Hari Singh's rules and the Hindus of Jammu including the Kashmiri Pandits. It is also true that under the able and effective leadership of Sheikh Abdullah Kashmiri Muslims exerted tremendous pressure on the ruler and eventually succeeded in obtaining certain important concessions, like the establishment of the *Praja Sabha* in 1934 and the enactment of the Jammu and Kashmir Constitutional Act of 1939. Both these constitutional measures did provide the people of the State an outlet to ventilate their opinion on

the floor of the *Sabha* and to shape and would the administrative policy of the government.

But there is also ample evidence to prove that the real motives behind the emergence of the Muslim Conference/National Conference were not merely the question of civil rights and responsible government but the Sheikh Abdullah's desire to organise Kashmiri Muslims against Jammu and the Hindu Maharaja and to establish in Kashmir Muslim rule headed by him.

As a matter of fact, tension between the people of Jammu and Kashmir regions had been brewing right from March 1846 when the Treaty of Amritsar, signed between Raja Gulab Singh of Jammu and the British Indian Government, created the modern State of Jammu and Kashmir. The Muslim leadership of Kashmir had taken the Treaty of Amritsar to mean the "slavery" under the Jammu Dogras. While Sheikh Abdullah's intervention was indispensable in raising the local issues to the State level, there is ample evidence to show that hatred and sectarian interests dominated Kashmir politics throughout 1846-1931). The only difference was the absence of an effective leadership to organise and strike. There was no leader of the stature of Sheikh Abdullah who would channelise the Kashmir anger and direct it towards the Hindus of Jammu and the ruler who happened to be a Hindu hailing from Jammu. At the same time, it needs to be emphasized that the ground for what Sheikh Abdullah could achieve after 1931 had already been prepared by the Muslim clergy of Kashmir. The culminating point or climax was not 1931 as is generally held but the year 1924.

When, in October 1924, Lord Reading, the Governor-General of India, visited Kashmir, Muslims used this as an opportunity to voice all their grievances, genuine or otherwise. They submitted six petitions containing details of atrocities and oppression allegedly practised upon the 12 lakh Muslims of Kashmir "probably to convert them to the Hindu religion". Most of the petitions alleged that *the religion of Islam* was

being dishonoured and insulted and attacks were being made upon the holy places of Islam. They also alleged that they were deprived of facilities in education and were not allowed any hand in the State administration though they alone filled the coffers of the State and willingly responded to call for men and money whenever any danger threatened the "Supreme Government" (Government of India). They condemned the "Hindu Government" on the ground that it had not allowed their telegrams and politicians to reach the Governor-General. They alleged that they wanted to meet Lord Reading personally but did not do so because the "military and police" did not allow. "The bigotted Hindu officials got cases made against us" (Muslims) and hence they could not meet the Governor-General. They even went to the extent of submitting that "We are sure that the moment Your Excellency will depart from the country (State), the bigotted administration together with their instruments, Kashmiri Pandits, will treat us worse and practise all possible tyrannies over us". The Muslims requested the Governor-General "to order arrangements through some Europeans by which our life and property can remain safe."

In the same month the Muslims of Kashmir through Baha-ud-Din, the *Khadim* of Dargah Khangah Maula, submitted another petition alleging that "from the time of the *Shudhi* movement had begun further tyrannies that created unbearable hardships to the unsupported, helpless and down-trodden" and that they had never been given share in the administration of the State. The target was Maharaja Pratap Singh. In this regard it may be noted that Pratap Singh during his rule (1885-1925) in no way supported the Arya Samaj movement. In fact, he opposed it. Another allegation of the Muslims of Kashmir was that the revenue of the sericulture factory was the earning of the Muslim alone and consisted of millions of rupees annually. In spite of that there was no adequate number of "Muslim and European officials" in the factory and that the "Hindu officials" treated the labourers very harshly and extorted bribes and troubled the workers in various ways. The Muslims reposed full confidence in the Europeans but expressed fear that

the "State being committed to Hindu protection would not listen to them."

One of the six petitions alleged that the Muslims were being oppressed under untold tyrannies and that they arranged extensive demonstrations to show their dissatisfaction against the Hindu rule. This never suited the "autocratic policy of the Darbar." They suppressed any voice being raised. Even certain respectable Muslims, who were appointed, were threatened with punishment "should their co-religionists raise a single voice." Their rights had been trampled their privileges denied and their peaceful requests "controverted by military attacks and their representations labelled as seditious". "They must naturally vent their feelings especially when they see the Ex-Lord Chief Justice of the British Empire coming as if sent by God...The voice was raised and the demonstrations made". "Such is the State of affairs...This is only one side picture of the treatment we receive. The full view can be obtained if Your Lordship are pleased to graciously accord audience to some of us..." "Should to our unredeemable misfortune all these things fail to move Your Lordship's pity, all we expect for after Your Lordship's safe return from the Valley is direct torture, blackest in the most horrible dungeon, exile, desecration on a large scale, violation of all religious toleration and most probably forcible conversion..."

Yet another petition submitted by the Muslims of Kashmir through the clergy to Lord Reading alleged that "all conceivable obstacles are placed in the way of (sic) education of Mohammedans." The staff of all the schools and colleges consists entirely of Hindus who naturally obstruct their education because they see their own dethronement in the educational progress of the Mohammedans...So far not a single scholarship out of a dozen scholarships has been given to the Mohammedans. They are made easily available to the Hindus but to discourage Mohammedans not a single scholarship is available." Another charge was that Pratap Singh had never directed his attention towards the betterment of Muslim education but rather kept silent with a view to rendering them "absolutely

idiots and illiterate". The petition condemned Pratap Singh and his government as "arrogant" and "heartless" and alleged that "there are many educated Mohammedans who are merely swelling the ranks of the unemployed while every possible post is given to a Hindu owing to the Hindu monopoly in all offices and departments of the State...The Education Department is almost exclusively manned by Hindus. The teachers in schools are all Hindus who create all kinds of difficulties in the way of Muslim pupils, and to their best to discourage them from joining schools or prosecute their studies. The State has, so far, granted many scholarships for advanced studies and training in India and abroad, but these grants have been invariably given to Hindus and the Muslims have been left in the cold...The Mussalmans of Kashmir are in a miserable plight today. Their educational needs are woefully neglected...To them who in face of all discouragement complete their courses, State service is denied and thus chief encouragement is taken away from those, who under better conditions, may have followed the foot steps of these ..And if per chance a Muslim does manage to secure some petty job (sic) invariably is sent out somewhere to the outlying frontier far away from home and people and he has only two alternatives to resign or to not."

Earlier on March 11, 1911, Aftab Ahmed Khan, Honorary Joint Secretary, Central Standing Committee of the All India Mohammedan Educational Conference, had submitted an appeal to Pratap Singh highlighting the backwardness of the Muslims in modern education. He had demanded immediate introduction of reforms to encourage education among them. A number of resolutions passed at the Rangoon and Nagpur Conferences of the All India Mohammedan Educational Conference, held in December 1907 and 1910, respectively, were also submitted for the Maharaja's consideration. The Conference had demanded the appointment of Muslim teachers in all government schools, appointment of Muslim inspectors of schools and creation of special scholarships for Muslim students. Again in 1913, the All India Mohammedan Educational Conference had presented an Address to the Maharaja

demanding, among other things, appointment of Muslims from outside the State to the education department.

Yet another petition had been submitted on May 5, 1914, by Syed Mohsin Shah, Honorary Secretary, Muslim Kashmiri Conference, Central Standing Committee, Lahore. The petition contained a number of resolutions passed at Sialkot under the Presidentship of Nawab Khawaja Mohd. Azam Khan of Dacca on April 25 and 26, 1914. The resolutions had urged upon the Maharaja the necessity of appointing Muslims from the outside the State to the education department.

It needs to be emphasized that the expansion of education in the State had been going on at a rapid pace between 1905 and 1915. During this period two colleges, one each at Srinagar and Jammu, two high schools, four middle schools and thirty two primary schools were opened. Bishan Das, the Education Minister, suggested in 1915 the appointment of an Education Commission with Sharp, Educational Commissioner to the Government of India, as its chairman, to examine the working of the education department. The Government accepted the proposal and that year Sharp's services were secured by the State Government. After thoroughly examining the education system, Sharp observed that the education provided in the State schools was satisfactory. However, to promote education among the Muslims, Sharp recommended the creation of more scholarships. He also laid stress on giving special concessions to the Islamia schools by way of increase in grants. Most of the recommendations of Sharp were accepted by the Maharaja and steps were soon taken to implement them.

Unfortunately, the Muslim's associations and their leaders did not realize that it was their duty to inculcate among the Muslims a new vision, a new life and a new blood. A number of petitions, on the other hand, attributed the backwardness of the Muslims in education to the lack of means and patronage and the great poverty of the community. The Muslim leadership condemned the educational policy on the ground that the instructions imparted were so impractical and so unsuited to

the requirement of the scholars that parents "necessarily" acquired a "distaste" for that instruction and avoided it as "something useless". Another important factor which prevented the Muslims of Kashmir from sending their children to schools was their desire of making them do sundry jobs from a very early age. "Education brings ruin, it is by ploughing that good living should be earned" sums up the Muslim agriculturists' attitude in the matter of education. The Hanjis of Kashmir also held similar view.

It was not the irrational policy, which prevented Muslims from joining the State schools. The real cause of backwardness was their apathy, their incapacity to take advantage of the facilities and the hostile attitude of their Mullahs and socio-religious associations towards western education. The State, from the very beginning, was anxious to help the Muslim community in all possible ways. It appointed a larger number of Muslim teachers to those town and village schools where the Muslims constituted a distinct majority. A special grant was provided in the budget for the award of scholarships to Muslim students. It is interesting to note that such a special grant was not sanctioned for any other community. But the Muslim leadership of Kashmir simply criticized measures of reform and looked askance at everything that was done to further their interests instead of taking advantage of State help as members of other communities were doing.

The Kashmiri leadership not only levelled serious charges against Pratap Singh and his government but demanded the introduction of reforms which appear anti-Hindu and purely sectarian. In August 1922, the President of the *Anjuman Nusrat-ul-Islam*, Srinagar, demanded, inter alia, (a) that the Muslims, who take lead in education be encouraged by grant of easy terms of service and concessions in employment and other inducements in their recruitment to responsible posts; (b) that an oriental school which would provide knowledge in English, Persian and Arabic on oriental lines be established so that the youngmen of their community, especially the Mullah class, might join it; (c) that those who were educationally

qualified be given preferential treatment in service and training and that they be appointed to higher posts; (d) that all primary schools be staffed by Muslim teachers, a large number of whom would, when needed, be available and, if so required, be supplied by the Muslim *Anjuman*, and that as soon as qualified Muslims available, higher posts in the education department be granted to them and one of the State high schools in Srinagar be headed by a Muslim; (e) that in all other schools where the headmasters could not be Muslims for lack of suitable men, a Muslim be appointed to the post of second master at least; (f) that liberal help in the form of scholarships be given to them; (g) that a fixed percentage in all other scholarships (Home and Foreign) be reserved for their exclusive benefit; (h) that an extra-ordinary help be given to the *Anjuman* schools; (i) that a special Muslim advisor be attached to the Member of Education (Education Minister); (j) that since the State high schools could not be at once staffed by Muslims for lack of qualified men, at least the headmasters and the inspecting-staff, should be Muslims; and (k) that proportionate number of posts be reserved for Muslims with due consideration of the percentage of Muslim population and appointments to these be made temporarily for the present till qualified and efficient Muslims were available in sufficient number to fill them.

The demands of the Muslims clearly indicate that their leaders were ignorant about the steps taken by the State government. Though it was admitted by all concerned that there was a dearth of Muslims possessing higher university qualifications and that graduates and under-graduates were rare, yet the Muslim leaders and their *anjumans* condemned the helpless and powerless Maharaja Pratap Singh. They did not raise their little finger against the British Resident who was all powerful. They only blamed the Hindus for the absence of Muslim teachers in the schools.

The *Khadimans* of Khangah Maula, Shah Hamadan, Srinagar, in one of their representations to Lord Reading asserted that even the Muslim ministers could do nothing under the fear of the State. They had been given false reports against the Muslim

community by their staff, which was entirely Hindu. Probably these false reports were also carried to the British Resident. In yet another petition they said that Kashmir was practically purely an agricultural country and the whole population of Kashmir depended for its staple food upon the labour of the cultivators (falahs) who were almost exclusively Muslims. Thus the Muslim agriculturist produced the food stuffs, built up the wealth of the State and supported and maintained the vast army of the State Officials and the splendour of the Darbar (Royal Court) with the sweat of his brow. All manual labour, which was necessary for the well being and prosperity of the State was performed exclusively by the Muslims. But for the Muslim labour and artisan the whole life of the State would come to a standstill and especially work involving danger to life and limb, i.e.; carrying mail on snow tracks of various degree be left undone as the remaining 3 per cent of the population consisting "mainly of pandits abhorred all kinds of manual labour for the best of all reasons that can afford to do so." The "Hindu bureaucracy" arrogant and heartless as it was could not even claim for itself the saving grace of efficiency and integrity. It was "hopelessly incompetent and corrupt knowing as it does that it is all powerful and that its victims are only the helpless Muslims who have no voice.... The few Muslim officials find themselves surrounded on all sides by the powerful Hindu cliques and are themselves impotent and demoralized lot."

Not only the Muslims of Kashmir, but the Muslims of British India, too, widened the gulf between the two communities and between the Muslims and the Maharaja. In a public meeting held under the auspices of the local Khilafat Committee at Lahore on September 13, 1924, under the Presidentship of M. Ghulam Mohi-Ud-Din Kasuri, the Kashmir administration, the Maharaja and the Hindus were condemned for their alleged indifferent attitude towards the Kashmiri Muslims. Syed Habib, Editor *Siyasat* went to the extent of saying that the humiliation was due to the fact that the Muslims had not yet realized that their inattention of the

spiritual potentialities of Islam had brought on their heads greatest distress which the Muslim people had ever witnessed in their history. Raja Gulab Singh of Kashmir had paid one crore of rupees to the English Government to make the Kashmiris as his everlasting slaves". The Jammu and Kashmir Government "never accorded a humane treatment to its subjects but rather flung them down in the depths of servitude". The Maharaja had never "directed his attention towards the betterment of their education, but rather kept them absolutely illiterates". The educational backwardness was the main cause of having made themselves "cowards and chicken-hearted". It was "certainly a lack of manners on the part of the Maharaja." The Kashmiri Muslims were "considered worse than the brutes". The Maharaja was under the impression that he had become "the sole master of honour, respect and even lives of the over-whelming majority of the Muslim subjects by paying rupees one crore to the British Government". Syed, however, attacked the British also on the ground that the English were mainly responsible for the negligence on the part of the Maharaja towards his Muslim subjects.

The allegations against the Maharaja and the Hindus were imaginary and exaggerated. Mountains were made out of mole-hills and trivial things were painted in lurid colours so as to inflame popular feelings. Many of the charges were exaggerated or of little serious moment. That the allegations against the Maharaja and the Hindus were imaginary is evident from the remarks of the Resident in Jammu and Kashmir during 1924, J.B. Wood, who asserted that the petitions or memorials contained "some obvious mis-statements and exaggerations" and remarked in unambiguous terms that "so far as his information goes, there are no such grievances on the part of the memorialists as would justify him making a representation to the Darbar."

It may be noted that J.B. Wood did not voice this opinion before the Muslims to remove their suspicion or misunderstanding. On the other hand, he, under the instructions of the Government of India demanded from the State Council (State

Cabinet) a brief report of facts relating to the charges levelled by the Kashmiri Muslims against Pratap Singh and the Hindus.

It may be pointed out that the Muslim leadership in presenting the memoranda failed to realize that for the past thirty years and more the machinery of administration had been in the hands of the British-Indian Government. Their grievances, real or otherwise, were the deads of the British rule and not of the Dogra Maharaja, who was a Maharaja only in name. The Maharaja then was nothing but a puppet in the hands of the British officials. All this naturally led to the estrangement of relations between the Muslims and the Maharaja and between the former and the Hindus.

In the Local Khilafat Committee meeting, Maulvi Abdul Gaffar Ghaznavi Amritsar advised the Muslims of India to raise their voice against the "cruel treatment of the Maharaja" in each and every corner of the country so that the Maharaja might realize that an overwhelming Muslim population of India was at the back of their distressed Kashmiri brethren. Syed Mohsin Shah, Secretary of the All India Kashmiri Muslim Conference, declared Kashmiris to be handsome, hardworking and great artisans, and urged the Muslim population of India to show their sympathy and solidarity with them. Mohammad Abdullah, another delegate, declared that "deed of grant given by the English to the Maharaja in return for rupees on crore, could not be a licence for him to humiliate the poor Muslims."

These were some of the allegations of the Muslims of Kashmir and their co-religionists living in British India against the Maharaja and the Hindus. They requested Lord Reading to institute an inquiry commission to look into the oppression practised upon the Kashmiri Muslims by the Hindus. They demanded that the inquiry commission be consisted of non-officials or Europeans. They even went to the extent of Calling Lord Reading a "God" sent to hear their grievances and to redress "our wrong". In fact, the arrival at Srinagar of Lord Reading had made the Muslims rejoice, One of the many requests of the Kashmiri leadership to Lord Reading was to

make the Resident in Kashmir responsible for the protection and position of the rights and interests of the Muslims.

That the approach of the Kashmiri leadership had become totally sectarian and communal is proved by the following demands :

1. That the Revenue and Settlement departments be reorganized with Kashmiri Muslims occupying the offices of the Revenue Member (Revenue Minister), the Provincial Governors, the Wazir-i-Wazarats (Deputy Commissioners) and the Tehsildars. This, according to the Muslim leadership, would save "the poor cultivators from wholesale corruption and extortions practised by the Revenue and Settlement departments consisted exclusively of Hindus with the sole exception of one Secretary to the Government.
2. That the Police department should be reorganized in order to restore confidence among the Muslims to whom it appeared "highly dangerous that the police department should be manned by the Hindus who look upon the Muslims as their natural enemies". Unless and until the Hindus were removed from the department, the usefulness of the highly competent and experienced British and Muslim officials would be greatly neutralised. Further steps should be taken to devise a system in which "a host of mischevious and dishonest Hindu subordinates who miss no opportunity of vilifying the Muslim community" had no say whatever.
3. Hindi should not be introduced in the State schools and offices for, according to the Muslim leadership, this measure "is bound to create a split and bitterness between the Hindus and Muslims.
4. That the Question of proprietary rights of land be settled once for all and that the Muslims of Kashmir restored to their due proprietary rights.

5. That the Muslim element in the State Council be increased in proportion to the population (Muslim) of Kashmir Province.
6. That further recruitment of Hindus in all grades of service should be henceforth stopped and to enable the Muslims of Kashmir to receive their legitimate share in the administration of the State all vacancies in all the departments caused by retirement, death or dismissal of the present incumbents henceforth be reserved for local Muslims. In case a local Muslim of requisite qualifications and abilities was not available a Muslim "may be imported from outside the State who should be of independent character and temporarily appointed till a local Muslim of requisite qualifications is available."
7. That to expel incompetent and corrupt officials from the State a commission of impartial officials be appointed to inquire into their character and efficiency so that the efficiency of the work be improved on the one hand and openings for the recruitment of Kashmiri Muslims to the State service created on the other and "the Muslim community saved from the long standing corruption and extortion."
8. That the Governor of a Province being the guardian of agriculturists, it was necessary that there should be a "Muslim Governor. In case the Muslims are not available for such high positions Europeans be appointed as Provincial Governors." Similarly, Assistant Superintendents of Police, Superintendents Customs etc. be recruited from among the Kashmiri Muslims. In case the Muslims of requisite qualifications were not available for such high posts, "Muslims from outside the State or Europeans" be appointed.
9. That the forest contracts and contractors connected with the construction of buildings and roads as well as other contracts were hitherto granted mostly to the

Hindus and non-state subjects and with the result much of the wealth of the State went out of the hands of Kashmiris. This practice should be stopped forthwith. Instead, contracts be granted to the State subjects in general and the "Muslim subjects in particular".

10. That in order to promote the interests of the Kashmiri Muslims engaged in export trade, including agricultural products, no duty should be imposed as such duty on exports "is injurious to the Muslim enterprise, as also" its effect is to lay embargo on many industries carried on solely by the Kashmiri Muslims." and
11. "Since (1921) the Residency control over the State administration has been withdrawn the Muslims' position in Kashmir has become all the more insecure and unsafe and the State authorities have without any hesitation trampled down the rights of the Muslims." To revive the old political set-up the Kashmiri Muslim leadership urged upon the Indian Government that the Kashmir Residency be re-invested with the same powers of control over the State that it exercised some 20 years ago and that the Residency be made responsible for promoting and protecting the Muslims' rights in the State in every matter.

All these demands leave no one in any doubt that the Kashmiri Muslims and their leadership had developed an hostile attitude towards Pratap Singh and the Hindus. The language in which they couched their demands unequivocally show that they had no love for the Hindus including the Muslims of the Jammu Province. Take for example the Muslims' opposition to the introduction of Hindi in the State schools. The remarks of the Muslim leadership that the teaching of Hindi was bound to create a split and bitterness among the major communities indicate how parochial the Kashmiri Muslims had turned. If Hindi could be regarded as the cause of split and bitterness why should Urdu or Persian be not put in the same heading. It may, however, be noted that Hindi was not the official language

of the State. The Kashmiri Muslims were not justified in seeking a ban on the teaching of Hindi in schools. Nowhere in British India had the teaching of Hindi been prohibited. The State also could not do differently; to do otherwise was to depart from the position of religious neutrality.

It is obvious that that the Muslim leadership did not demand introduction of reforms for the general welfare of the people of the State irrespective of caste, creed and colour. It simply highlighted the Muslims' problems, genuine and imaginary, criticised the Maharaja and his government and the Hindus and demanded immense powers to be exercised by the British Resident, the Muslims of Kashmir and outside and Europeans. Some of the demands as put forth by the Kashmiri Muslims and their leadership would have been cherished by all had they taken into account the general happiness of the masses. Since most of the demands were sectarian and regional, these vitiated relations between the Kashmiri Muslims and the Hindus and thus disturbed the peaceful condition which process of development and progress badly needed. thereafter there was no return from where the Muslims of Kashmir and their leadership had reached.

On October 27, 1924, Hari Singh, Foreign Minister, submitted a memo to the State Council relating to the six petitions containing details of atrocities and oppression allegedly committed by the Maharaja, his administration and the Hindus on the Kashmiri Muslims. As the alleged grievances covered a great amount of ground and dealt with a large variety of subjects relating to almost all State departments, Hari Singh thought it better to discuss all the main points of these memorials in a special meeting of the State Council. Ultimately, on October 30, 1924, the State Council, appointed a sub-committee consisting of the Revenue Minister (Convener), Public Works Minister and Finance and Police Minister to report to the State Council on the general situation.

The sub-committee did not consider it necessary to deal individually with each case of the several representations, certain

of which were of an anonymous nature, because the alleged grievances which they contained were all set forth in one memorial Number 5 dealing exhaustively with every variety of complaints and disabilities on the part of the Muslims of Kashmir. Memorial number 5 had been presented by Maulvi Ahmed Ullah, Mir Waiz Kalan, Mir Waiz Hamadani, Maulvi Atiq Ullah, Khan Hassan Shah Naqshbandi, Khan Shah-Ud-Din Shawl, Syed Hassan Shah Jalali, Maulvi Sharief-Ud-Din, Sayyed Said Shah Jalali and Jafar Khan.

The sub-committee summoned each of these individuals to appear and explain the contents of their representations. Many of them appeared and recorded their statements. The findings of the committee made the members conclude that the allegations contained in the portion of the memorials were exaggerated and that they were couched in the most improper and objectionable language. However, the committee admitted that the proportion of Muslim officials in the State was small, but observed that this was due to the difficulty of securing suitable Muslim candidates. The committee also observed that the situation in British India was no different. The committee further observed that the number of Muslim employees was gradually being increased, but until the Muslim community took advantage of the educational facilities which the State government provided, it was "unreasonable" to expect the State to take Muslims into service in proportion to their population. However, the committee asked the signatories to the memorials to bring to their notice specific complaints of corruption or prejudices on the part of the State officials.

It needs to be highlighted with regard to the complaint of the Kashmiri Muslims regarding under-representation in the government service that the detailed information contained in the memorials was frequently inaccurate and the number of Muslim employees minimized. This was the case, for instance, in regard to the police and accounts department as the memorialists themselves admitted. It appeared from the statements of some of them that the statistics were supplied by Shah-Ud-Din Shawl and were "blindly accepted". As regards the Revenue department the

assertion that "even the orderlies, jamadars and peons are almost all Hindus" was nothing short "of grotesque". The memorial gave the impression that, apart from one member of the State Council, Muslims were debarred from holding high positions in the State. It will not be out of place to mention here a few instance to refute this contention. Of the two Chief Judges in the State, one was a Muslim. Of the two Superintendents of Police, one was a Muslim. The Highest Indian official in the Settlement Department was a Muslim. One Muslim official was the head of the Co-operative Department. In the Revenue Department there were many Muslims holding important positions. For example, in Kashmir Province two of the three Wazir-i-Wazarats (officials below that of the Provincial Governors) were Muslims.

One of the allegations against the government was that the Pandits were regarded as beyond the reach of law. The memorialists when called upon to substantiate the charge, failed to adduce any instance in support of their allegation that the Pandits were beyond the reach of law while the Muslims were "victimized with impunity".

As regards educational policy, the memorialists acknowledged before the committee inaccuracies in their statements that the "teachers in schools are all Hindus" and that "on scholarships for training in India" had "been awarded by the Darbar to Muslims". In fact, the memorialists could adduce nothing in the nature of a proof that the Muslim students were discouraged as such from attending academic institutions in the State.

It had been alleged in the memorial number 5 that an unfair distinction was made in municipal amneties extended respectively to the Hindus and Muslims. The members of the committee inspected personally large number of mohallas in Srinagar city. It is certainly a fact that the municipal administration in the State was rather lax, but the disabilities from which the inhabitants suffered were shared equally by both communities. It may be noted that several of the memorialists had been

members of the municipal committee and they themselves were by no means free from the responsibility of disregarding public interests and general welfare.

With regard to the emergence of dissension between the two communities and disloyalty to the Maharaja and his government, the committee observed that this had been fostered to a large extent by agitators from British India. There are reasons to believe that certain *Khadims* of the States Hamadan Shrine and other persons after visiting British India had returned to Kashmir and disseminated the idea that the Viceroy was visiting the State in order to "displace the Hindu dynasty and establish Mohammedan rule". It may not be astonishing that such "idle rumours should be credited by the uneducated masses".

Finally the committee expressed the view that the Muslim interests had not in any way suffered and the "Darbar have shown no prejudice against their Mohammedan subjects, nor they have any intention of departing from the strict observance of impartiality in future."

The Committee in their recommendations pin-pointed that the "main ring-leaders" behind the episode were Shad-Ud-Din Shawl and Hassan Shah Naqshbandi and recommended that the former be expelled from the State. Regarding Hassan Shah, the committee noted that the leading part played by him in this disloyal movement was all the reprehensible because "his family has long enjoyed and continue to enjoy the benefits of a jagir granted to them by the Hindu ruler." The committee recommended that Hassan Shah's share in the Jagir "should now be forfeited."

Pratap Singh accepted the recommendations with "great pain". He made it clear that it had always been and "will always be my aim to deal impartially with classes of my people whose welfare is very dear to my heart."

The findings of the committee did not satisfy the Kashmiri Muslims and others living in British India. They once again started a vilification campaign against the Maharaja and the

Hindus. The Executive Committee of the *Anjuman-i-Islamia* condemned the expulsion from the State of a leading Rais Shad-ud-Din Shawl and the confiscation of the Jagir of Hassan Shah. The committee urged the Maharaja to rescind his orders. The Editor of the *Muslim Outlook* threatened to start an agitation in case the Maharaja failed to rescind his orders, and remarked that the grievances of the Kashmiri Muslims were "genuine". He also demanded appointment of an inquiry commission to look into the charges and grievances of Muslims of Kashmir.

Even after the report of the sub-committee had been made public and most of the signatories failed to substantiate their charges the attitude of the Muslims did not change. The *Muslim Outlook* again alleged that the "Hindu-ridden administration of the State had only become more determined than ever to victimize the helpless masses on whose labour it grows fat... This is a grave insult which the State is doing to Islam..."

It was further alleged that the Hindu personal law had helped to make the local Muslims veritable slaves not only of the government, but also of the Hindu citizens. "Only a handful of lallas and Pandits prospered on account of the Muslim labour. The picture more or less is one of those ancient Greek and Roman politics which divided their citizens into two rigid classes—the citizen proper and the slaves whatever symbols of civilization these politics had been built by the bleeding hands of the slaves under the lashes of their task masters's long whip... But it is not for the builders to enjoy the results of their labour or to regard it as theirs. The parks, the baths, the palaces, the public and private buildings, the money and leisure provided by the slaves' labour for his masters, belonged strictly to the latter. This is perhaps the worst feature of his heartless social system...The slaves are taught to regard their race as something less than human, as irrevocably and Divinely condemned to a lot which is the only proper one for them." By a curious law of the State the peasants were forbidden to defend farms against the savages of the wild beasts." "Between themselves, the wild beasts of the jungle and the human harpies, the money lenders consumed the produce of the poor farmer's labour, who went

on labouring for year to years and under an ever increasing burden of debt. The courts give him no 'protection against his oppressors and the State show absolutely no anxiety to educate him or to uplift him to the level of humanity.' It was further observed that more than once in the past the Muslims of Kashmir had the occasion to memorialise upon their difficulties in the words of the poet :

"We lose ovr reputation when we complain. No body takes notice even when they commit murder. But nothing is done to redress the Muslims' grievances".

A perusal of the resolutiyns passed by the Muslim associations, such as the Khilafat Conference, the All India Mohammedan Educational Conference, the *Anjuman-i-Islamia* and others and the various petitions and memorials submitted by the Kashmiri leadership to the Resident and the Governor-General of India and the findings of the inquiry committee appointed by the State Council makes it abundently clear that the Muslims' sole aim was to condemn and cricise Pratap Singh and his government and the Hindus to obtain certain political concessions, especially the establishment of Muslim rule in Kashmir. The Muslim leaders, two of whom were the signatories to the memorial submitted to Lord Reading in October 1924, "Persistently" obstructed any attempt at improvement and reform. This clearly indicates that the aim of the Muslims was not to seek reform and improvement but to create a situation conducive for the establishment of muslim rule in the Valley. None of the resolutions and memorials criticised the Government of India or its agents posted in the State who controlled the administration. The resolutions and memorials passed and presented by socio-religious and political associations and the writings in the press of the Muslims played a considerable role in exciting Kashmiri Muslims' fanaticism against the Hindus and in creating separatist tendencies. (For details see Hari Om, *Muslims of Jammu and Kashmir*, Archives Publisher, Tagore Garden Exten., New Delbi, 1986).

Unjustifiable criticism against the powerless Maharaja and

Hindus and the unstinted support to the Resident and the Crown simply raised a high wall separating the two main communities, the Hindus and the Muslims of Kashmir, and disturbing communal harmony and amity. (The petitions had praised the Residents for their interference in the State's internal administration, till 1921. The Muslims of Kashmir had even went to the extent of calling the Governor-General of India a God.)

In fact, it was in 1924 and not in 1931 that serious and an extreme form of tension between Jammu and Kashmir regions on the one hand between the Muslims of Kashmir and the Maharaja and between the Muslims and the Hindus on the other developed. There were communal riots in all the major towns such as Srinagar, Anantnag and other places. For all these unfortunate events, the Muslims of Kashmir and their leadership held Pratap Singh and the Hindus responsible. What happened in the State between 1931 and 1947 is known to all. There were agitations against the Hindu Maharaja. Communal tensions rocked the State and ultimately culminated into the "Quit Kashmir" movement in 1946.

It needs to be pointed out that Sheikh Abdullah was the main character in the anti-Hindu drama enacted during the period. He had cherished the dream of a Switzerland type independent Kashmir. He started his political career with all the precision and clarity but trod it with all the care and caution. He was a leader of Kashmir, essentially of the Kashmiri Muslims. Kashmir was the corner-stone of his politics. He set up the Muslim Conference in 1932 to fulfil this cherished aim and renamed it as National Conference which was a mere change of strategy with his eyes fixed on his goal of independent Kashmir. Coupled with the religious appeal he exploited "Kashmiriat" to the hilt and fomented agitation after agitation against the princely ruler of the time and thus built up a strong Kashmiri movement in the Valley. The connotation of his "Quit Kashmir" slogan in his 1946 movement against the Maharaja shows that the Sheikh had the vision of a full-fledged independent Kashmir in his mind after ousting the ruler (پوری).

ved as an alien) in the manner the Indian National Congress had the vision of an independent India envisaged by the "Quit India" movement against the British.

The genesis of the on going secessionist militancy in the Valley lies in the pre-1947 developments in the State politics. The fundamental contradictions in the attitude, approach and perceptions of the people of the two regions have brought the nation to such a critical situation. The earlier agreements such as the 1975 Indira-Sheikh Accord and the 1987 Rajiv-Farooq Accord are crumbling like the House of cards.

Thus it is beyond any doubt that right from the beginning the Kashmiri leadership looked the Maharaja and the Hindus with contempt, hated and suspicion and regarded them "aliens". The leadership reposed full confidence in the British officials and sought their intervention in the State so that its demands were supported. It even advocated the employment of the Indian Muslims to man top and subordinate posts under the State government. The leadership did not show any inclination of making a common cause with their Hindu and Muslim brothers inhabiting the Jammu division and Kashmiri Pandits in the Valley.

Also the Kashmiri leadership did not regard the Muslims of the Jammu Province a part of its movement. The memoranda and petitions of the Muslim leadership submitted to the Indian Government and the Crown representatives in the State from time to time eloquently proves this point. The resolutions and petitions submitted by the Kashmiri leadership neither voiced the grievances nor asked for the protection of the rights and privileges of the Jammu region.

The Kashmiri leadership, undoubtedly, had soft corner for the Europeans and the Muslims hailing from other parts of India. The leadership unambiguously and unequivocally showed concern only for safeguarding and promoting the regional interests and aspirations, particularly those of the Muslims of Kashmir. They showed absolutely no interest for the general population of the State. The present plight

of Jammu Muslims, the Hindus and other non-Muslims makes the things crystal clear. Right from the beginning the Kashmiri leadership adopted a rather discriminatory attitude towards the people of Jammu. The underrepresentation in the State services of Hindu and Muslim officials hailing from the Jammu region is sufficient to prove the oft-repeated charge that they are being grossly neglected and discriminated against in every sphere and in every walk of life. A visit to Doda, Poonch and Rajouri districts in the Jammu region is enough to find out the pitiable condition in which the people, especially the Muslims are languishing for want of patronage and consideration. Even a superficial study of their share in the government services, and development of these areas will make one jump to the conclusion that the Kashmiri leadership was and is rapidly opposed to those living in the Jammu division.

That the Kashmiri leadership regarded the Maharaja and the Hindus of the Jammu region "aliens" and that it hated and denounced them is evident from the poem in Urdu published in the *Kashmiri Magazine*.

"The Maharaja of Hindu religion is the ruler of our country".

"Our affairs are in the hands of aliens."

"For this reason our life and death is in the grip of their hands."

"Funds for schools and madrasahs are being raised from us".

"But other nationalities benefit by them."

"A Brahmin wins Maharaja's favours because he is of the same faith."

"For this reason we receive no honour in the court of the Maharaja."

"To be sure the majority of the State subjects are Mohammedans".

“But this numerical superiority did not raise our fortune in balance.”

It should be in this context that the ongoing secessionist movement in the Valley be viewed. This would help find out lasting solutions to the problems facing the country in general and Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh in particular. (*Daily Excelsior*, Jammu, July 2-7, 1990)

Conflicting Perceptions

Much has been written and is still being written on Kashmir and the unprecedented upsurge there for "Azadi". A number of schools of thought have appeared expressing different and contradictory views regarding the genesis of the Kashmir imbroglio and putting forth possible solutions to tackle the rather serious problem the ongoing secessionist movement in the Valley have posed to the unity and integrity of India and to the very roots of the Indian secularism. What has happened and is still happening in Kashmir since January 1990, has caused anguish and deep concern to the authorities, the well-wishers of India and the Muslim and non-Muslim populace of Kashmir, including Kashmiri Pandits, Dogras, Punjabis, Gujjars, Bakarwals etc. who had to leave their homes and hearths fearing physical liquidation at the hands of the secessionists and terrorists. The number of nationalists including the Muslims, who fell victims to the gun-wielding militants, terrorists, and pro-Pakistan and pro-independence champions is well known. To what extent the secularism and democratic process have been rendered a sham, ineffective and irrelevant and unreal for all practical purpose is evident from the total exodus of the Kashmiri Pandits from the Valley.

The rise of a number of schools of thought adding new dimensions to the Kashmir separatist movement and working and writing on it is not at all surprising. In fact, such a development is natural under the prevailing circumstances. The

writings and views are both objective and subjective. However, some of the writings reflect the predilection of the writers and opinion-makers and leave no one in any doubt that certain forces are ignoring the hard realities in Kashmir. Surprisingly, however there is unanimity on one point : Pakistan's open interference in Kashmir affairs and financial aid from Iran, Pakistan and Saudi Arabia.

The rising schools of thought, in the light of an examination of the leadership including politicians, journalists, publicmen, academicians, writers and human rights champions, and the speeches they have made and the writings contributed to the media, giving expression to various causes leading to the current turmoil in the Valley and possible solutions to overcome the same, may be classified under five broad headings, namely : schools represented by (1) the Congress—I National Conference (2) the socialists and Communists, (3) the so-called champions of human rights, (4) the Bhartiya Janta Party (BJP) and similar other parties, like the Shiv Sena, journalists and bureaucrats, like Arun Shourie, Girilal Jain and A.P. Venketeshran and writers, like Dr. Rahi Masoom Raza and (5) Prof. Balraj Madhok and Sahabuddin.

The school led by the Congress-I has interpreted the insurgency in Kashmir as a baby of the Janta Dal and is looking for an opportune moment to exploit this and other problems facing the country to woo a section of the Muslim electorate. The speeches made by Rajiv Gandhi, the Congress-I president and the leader of the opposition in the Lok Sabha, his associates like M.J. Akbar, during the AICC session held in New Delhi for three days from July 22, 1990, have made it clear that they have no plan of helping the National Front Government to solve this ticklish problem and that their main concern is the next parliamentary elections. It is also discernible from what transpired at the session that the Congress wants the V.P. Singh's government to shoulder the responsibility of meeting the challenge thrown by the militants. Indeed, the Congress leaders projected only those points, facts and opinions at the AICC session which

sulted their predilections making the prevailing confusion about the national sensitive issue worse confounded.

Everything that was done and said there at the AICC session was nothing but absolutely subjective. During the meeting no reference was made to the grave misdeeds including corruption and politics of feathering one's own nest. Corruption, inefficiency and mal-administration were the three fruits the Congress, the National Conference or the Congress-National Conference combine gave the people of the State to eat. Who, in India, is not aware of the unfortunate role Rajiv Gandhi played in Kashmir during his last visit to the Valley. It may be recalled that Rajiv Gandhi alongwith Devi Lal, the then Deputy Prime Minister, George Fernandes, the Union Railway Minister and the then Minister Kashmir Affairs, Kidar Nath Sahni, M. Farooqi and others had gone to Srinagar to make an on-the-spot study of the Kashmir situation. Rajiv Gandhi's rough behaviour with Jagmohan at Srinagar is too well known for it evoked strong reaction from the print media. To what extent he and his party want to contribute to the solution of the Kashmir problem has become evident there and then.

The thinking of the National Conference and its leaders, like Farooq Abdullah, the former Chief Minister, Prof. Saif-ud-Din Soz (MP) and others is no different. To them the only cause responsible for the ongoing struggle for independence in Kashmir was the appointment of Jag Mohan as the Governor of the State in January 1990 and his alleged inhuman policies. Who, in India, doesn't know the abdication of authority by Farooq Abdullah and his adherents and the Congress leaders at a time when their services the country needed most. The cosy and comfortable stay and holidaying of Farooq Abdullah and his comrades in London, Delhi and elsewhere is no secret. What was more intriguing was Farooq's interpretation of the Government of India's invitation and request to him to come to India from his foreign hideout to help tackle the Kashmir problem as a well thoughtout plan of liquidating him physically. India should not expect positive contribution from the National Conference leadership which is advocating solution to the problem

under the 1948-49 UN resolutions and the 1972 Simla Agreement.

The second viewpoint is represented by leaders, like George Fernandes, Jyoti Basu, Chandra Shekhar, Hari Kishan Singh Surjeet, Saif-Ud-Choudhury, M. Farooqi etc. This brand of leadership sees erosion of the Kashmiri identity and genesis of the Kashmir problem in the extension of central laws, including (a) the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of India; (b) the Jurisdiction of the Election Commission of India; (c) provisions of Article 312 of the Indian Constitution (It may be recalled that in 1958, the All India Services were extended to the State through an amendment to Article 312.); (d) the Jammu and Kashmir Constitution Amendment Act of 1939 (Section 75 had made the Jammu and Kashmir Council of Ministers the final interpreter of the Constitution.); and enabling the President of India to issue the Constitution Application for Jammu and Kashmir Order extending the jurisdiction of the Centre from the original three subjects of Defence, Foreign Affairs and Communications to all the subjects in the Union List; (e) change on March 30, 1965, in the nomenclature in Jammu and Kashmir for different designations dropping *Sadar-e-Riasat* and *Waziri-aazam* to Governor and Chief Minister; (f) the assumption on February 25, 1975, of power by the Indian Parliament to declare Jammu and Kashmir "a constituent Unit of India" and also the retention of power to legislate on any matter concerning the territorial integrity of the country; (g) the BJP's demand for scrapping Article 370 of the Indian Constitution; and (h) the demand for one constitution and one Flag and so on.

To accept the viewpoint of this kind of leadership means no confidence in the Indian Constitution. It would also mean violation of fundamental rights and preferential and differential treatment to a particular group of people and a particular region denying the same to others. To this school of thought, Kashmir is Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh. This school further believes that the preservation of the Kashmiri identity will automatically preserve the identity of the entire State

of Jammu and Kashmiri Besides, preservation of Kashmiriat would go a long way in fulfilling the politico-social aspirations of the people of Jammu and Ladakh. This, according to this leadership, would also mean strengthening of secularism in Kashmir and the rest of India. What to talk of the economic discontent, frustration and political aspirations of the people of Jammu and Ladakh, this school does not even consider it imperative to make them parties to discussions on Kashmir, if any. This school, it appears, has made up its mind to throw in the lot of the people of Jammu and Ladakh with the inconstant Kashmir.

The second viewpoint also finds the origin of the Kashmir separatist movement and insurgency in the long hours of curfew, the so-called unemployment of Kashmiri youth, Kashmir's under-development and the Indian Government's failure to encourage investment in the Valley. It is indeed intriguing that this school is absolutely ignorant of the pace with which progress has taken place in Kashmir during the last 43 years with the people of Jammu and Ladakh being forced to adopt a policy of political mendicancy. It is unbelievable that leaders like Saifuddin Choudhury are unaware of the pumping into Kashmir of Rs. 70,000 crores after independence. It will not be out of place to mention here that Kashmir which constitutes nearly 90 per cent area less than Jammu and Ladakh and just about 50 per cent of the State population has taken away "more than 75 per cent" of the Central aid, leaving a paltry 25 per cent to be shared between Jammu and Ladakh.

This leadership has suggested a rather simple formula for the solution of the Kashmir problem. The formula, according to it, if accepted, would go a long way in solving the tangle. The formula is..."..measures which address themselves to the masses, like relaxing curfew and helping ease their hardships, generating employment and encouraging investment or development..." be adopted. One of the protagonists of this school is Saifuddin Choudhury, a Marxist and a member of the Lok Sabha. The suggestion, however, betrays ignorance of the leaders about the

loud and clear declaration by the militants and secessionists that "theirs" is a political and not economic problem."

This viewpoint also enjoys the backing of a certain section of the Janta Dal leadership, including the one which belongs to the Jammu and Kashmir State. The recent meeting at Delhi in the last week of July 1990 between the Indian Prime Minister and other General leaders and the State Janta Dal leaders, like Dhanraj Badgotra and Dr. Satya Pal, and the points the State Janta Dal leaders made during the meeting indicate that they, like Saifuddin Choudhury, see in the generation of more employment opportunities for the Kashmiri youth, encouragement of investment or development in the Valley an opportunity of bringing the militants, pro-Pakistani and pro-independence forces to the national mainstream. The press reports clearly suggest that these leaders did not plead the case of the Jammu youth and the need for all round development of Jammu and Ladakh regions.

The second school of thought appears prepared to concede to Kashmir the pre-1953 political set up. This ill-conceived. Anti-India, anti-Jammu and anti-Ladakh suggestion, if accepted, would mean sacrifice of the politico-economic aspirations of the people of Jammu and Ladakh in favour of the Valley. (The plight of the people of Jammu and Ladakh is now well known. The articles, 'State of Jammu : alienated from the Valley' (The *Statesman*, June 20, 1990), 'Flames in Kashmir : Turmoil in Jammu' (The *Voice of Millions*, New Delhi, June 1990 , 'What Jammu wants' (The *Indian Express*, New Delhi, July 7, 1990 and 'The case of Jammu' (The *Indian Express*, July 24, 1990) make the extent to which the people of Jammu and Ladakh have been exploited politically, economically and administratively crystal clear. (For details see Chapters IV, V and VI and Appendixes II, IV).

The restoration of the pre-1953 political arrangement would also mean the inability of the Indian Parliament to legislate on matters other than Defence, Foreign Affairs and Communications; revival of the permit system for the abolition of which

Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee, the Bhartiya Jana Sangh President, and other leaders of the All Jammu and Kashmir Praja Parishad sacrificed their precious lives in 1953; change in the nomenclature in Jammu and Kashmir for different designations from Governor and Chief Minister to the Sadar-e-Riyasat and Waziriaazam; withdrawal of the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and the Election Commission and the Auditor and Comptroller General; withdrawal of central laws and reservation for the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes; an easy tool for secession not only for Kashmir but also for Punjab and certain North-Eastern States and humiliation of India in the international world charged with an allegation that India held the Kashmiris as a hostage for the last 43 years.

The third school is led by V.M. Tarkunde and other champions of human rights with prominent among them being Rajinder Sachar, Amrikh Singh, Inder Mohan, Ranjan Dwividi, N.D. Pancholi, T.S. Ahuja and Balraj Puri. My views on these so-called champions of human rights are well known and have found important space in the national and local papers and journals, like the *Indian Express*, May 15, 1990, *Organiser* New Delhi, June 3, 1990, the *National Herald*, Lucknow, July 20, 1990, and the Voice of Jammu, the *Daily Excelssior*, May 9, 1990. I reiterate that these human rights champions are not at all concerned with the unity and integrity of India. Their main concern, it appears, is to provide disinformation to the Indian adversaries so that this may be used by the militants, pro-Pakistan or Pro-Azadi protagonists and their sympathisers who are there in strength in the State Secretariat and other government offices and forces hostile to India like Pakistan, Iran and Saudi Arabia. I repeat the assertion I made that their report on Kashmir is nothing but an affront to the patriotic Indians and to the State. (For detail see Appendixes III and V). The so-called champions of human rights appear to have openly joined the secessionists and pro-Pakistani elements in denouncing the policy of the government and in supporting their demand for "independence and not Pakistan". Their views on the handling of the Kashmir situation are identical with those expressed repeatedly by the Pakistan Government, its print and

electronic media, and the Kashmiri secessionists. Pakistan has, undoubtedly, found in the persons of the human rights champions a STICK to beat India with and to malign India in the eyes of the civilized world. Those who had the opportunity to watch the Pakistani television on April 28, 1990, and thereafter know the use Pakistan Government has made of the Report of the human rights champions.

The position I took on May 15 stands vindicated by the letters I received from a number of activists of the PUCL and a number of letters and articles appeared in the *Indian Express*, the *National Herald* the *Times of India* and the latest despatch of Brij Bhardwaj which appeared in the *Hindustan Times*, on July 30, 1990. The degree of condemnation the human rights champions and their report evoked is evident from two of the letters to Arun Shourie, the Editor, *Indian Express*, with copies to me. The letter of Randheer Jain, an Advocate Supreme Court of India, dated May 15 reads :

"I fully endorse the views expressed by Dr. Hari Om (IE May 15). Conduct of the so-called champions of human rights, in publishing onesided and cooked-up report concerning Jammu and Kashmir is nothing but a blatantly unpatriotic act of treason on the part of M/s. V.M. Tarkunde & Co...I was amongst the first to join the citizens For Democracy and later People's Union for Civil Liberties and Democratic Rights when they were formed; a little before and during emergency. Its members (and so many advocates) fought against emergency and repression let loose by the illegitimate Government of that despot called Indira Gandhi. When Mr. Tarkunde and his band joined us in exposing and protesting the murder of democracy in Amethi during elections of November 1989 we still look him as our leader. But the conduct of these people may even raise a question mark against those of us who prided in fighting for the cause of justice and democracy. Now the only one course left open for every self-respecting patriotic Indian and that is nothing less and nothing more but complete social boycott of these people."

The views expressed by M.V. Ramamurthy, Vice-President of the Andhra Pradesh Unit of the PUCL, and S. Kumar, Advocate Supreme Court, too, are identical. Ramamurthy wrote in May : "It should not be the concern of the PUCL to canvass support for the militants indirectly on the ground that the people of Kashmir are for independence and not for joining Pakistan. It is not given to PUCL to assess the minds of the people of Kashmir when there is no known method of gauging public opinion...It is beyond the purview of the PUCL to suggest reconciliation. One wonders whom the team had in mind. Is it the section of militants that must be appeased or the leaders of the public opinion in Kashmir who did not raise their little finger to condemn violence on the part of the militants ? The PUCL team erred in not drawing lesson from the fact that some Hindus have taken shelter in camps in Delhi also. The team should not have opined that setting up of camps was not necessary." Indeed, it was inhuman on the part of the human rights champions not to visit the camps to see for themselves the woes of the Kashmiri migrants and to listen to their horrowing and frightful tales which forced them to leave the beautiful Valley.

One of the significant observations which Bhardwaj made in his despatch was : "The strong supporters of the human rights theory have been the government employees here who went on a three-day strike in support of various demands, including alleged excesses by the para-military forces."

Surprisingly also, this school has no formula to suggest to solve the Kashmir tangle. The only solution they offered is "lifting of curfew and withdrawal of para-military forces from the Valley."

The suggestion that the security forces should be withdrawn from the downtown areas so that the on going phase of killing and cross-firing could be stopped and the people live in peace is rather dangerous under the prevailing circumstances. The champions are apparently ignoring the vital fact that the withdrawal of the security forces will give an impetus to the hiding

militants “who have lost much of their striking power because of the loss of mobility.” Moreover, the suggestion, if accepted, would enable the “sympathisers and supporters of the militants to arrange and organize massive processions and demonstrations and convert the defeat of the militant phase of their struggle into a civil disobedience movement.” This line of action is clearly elaborated in the plans prepared by Pakistan intelligence. It is well-known that many “militants and pro-Pak elements in the Valley are advocating a change of strategy as they feel that the militant phase has achieved its objective by drawing world attention to the Kashmir problem and the same can be kept focussed through other means now for which the Kashmiri youth need not pay such a heavy price.”

In conclusion it can be safely said that this school of thought has proved instrumental in jeopardising India's legitimate interests and in weakening its sovereignty.

The fourth school of thought represented by parties, like the BJP and the Shiv Sena and eminent persons, like Arun Shourie, a noted journalist and Editor, *Indian Express*, Girilal Jain, a former Editor, *The Times of India*, A.P. Venketeshran, a former Foreign Secretary to the Indian Government, and Dr. Rahi Masoom Raza, a world known writer and the one who by his philosophical contributions made B.R. Chopra's serial on Mahabharata immortal.

The views expressed repeatedly by leaders, like L.K. Advani, the BJP President, Attal Bihari Bajpai, Kidar Nath Sahni etc. and Arun Shourie, Girilal Jain, A.P. Venketeshran and Dr. Rahi Masoom Raza are identical. Each one of these regards Article 370 of the Indian Constitution and the very existence of Pakistan dangerous for both are posing a serious threat to the unity, integrity and sovereignty of India.

It is well-known that Article 370 has guaranteed to Jammu and Kashmir State a very larger measure of autonomy than is enjoyed by any other State of the Indian Union. The BJP leaders and others are holding similar views are arguing that Article 370 has directly and indirectly retarded the process of

the complete integration of the State of Jammu and Kashmir with the Indian Union. They state that the time has now come for the abrogation of this Article and placing the State of Jammu and Kashmir on the same footing as the other States in the Indian Union. Those who advocate this view express their disapproval of the fact that citizens in India are not able to acquire property in Jammu and Kashmir unless they are permanent residents of the State as defined in part III of the Constitution of Jammu and Kashmir while the persons belonging to the State are entitled to acquire property anywhere in the rest of India. They are also arguing that no other State in the Indian Union has an independent constitution of its own and the existence of an independent constitution for Jammu and Kashmir had an adverse effect upon the process of complete integration of the State with the Indian Union besides precipitating crisis in other States, particularly Punjab. It is indeed interesting to note that even the President of India can have no immovable property in the Jammu and Kashmir State.

While the BJP leaders are advocating the concept of 'Aakhand Bharat' with constitutional safeguards and guarantees for the minorities, including the Muslims, the journalists, like Arun Shourie and Girilal Jain and the bureaucrats, like A.P. Venketeshran are advocating "dismemberment of Pakistan and re-conquest of Pak-Occupied-Kashmir". (Extracts from speeches delivered by Shourie, Girilal Jain, Venketeshran, Lt. Gen. Candott, S.L. Shakdhar and Kidar Nath Sahni etc. in the Himachal Bhawan, New Delhi, on July 24, 1990). Most of these eminent personalities and opinion-makers have gone to the extent of urging the Indian Government that "there is no way to save Kashmir except by teaching Pakistan a lesson—Pakistan which is trying to dismember India...The Government should engage the Afganistani Intelligence to meet the challenge posed by Islamabad...Israel should also to be imitated by establishing close friendly relations with it."

Arun Shourie is even anticipating a war by Pakistan despite its weaknesses due to the ongoing ethnic clashes in Sindh between Sindhis and the Mohajjirs and between them and the

Pathans. Pakistan's weakness is also due to the serious problem Islamabad is facing in North Western Frontier Province (Baluchistan). Tussle between Islamabad and Pakistan-Occupied-Kashmir (POK) is also well-known. Arun Shourie has urged the Indians to prepare themselves for the eventuality (war). "The country must prepare itself for a long-drawn and decisive war with dismemberment of Pakistan as its chief objective. We must also prepare the people for the consequences of what we preach."

In addition, these eminent persons are pleading for the immediate abrogation of Article 370. "Every Article which gives any special status to any people or any region should be abolished forthwith."

Dr. Rahi Masoom Raza, on the other hand, is suggesting that: "The people of India and the Government in Delhi should make it loud and clear to all concerned, that Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of this country and will continue to remain so. The national integrity of India is not negotiable and cannot be a subject-matter of bargain and that its sovereignty is indivisible. Under no circumstances should the demand for the so-called self-determination be conceded to the Kashmiris or to any other group of people."

Dr. Rahi Masoom Raza feels that the Kashmir imbroglio would not have surfaced at all had the Indian Government under the Primeministership of Pandit Nehru not taken the internal issue to the United Nations in 1948 which resulted in the passing of a few resolutions in 1948-49 recognising Pakistan as a party to the issue. "It was a Himalayan blunder" on the part of Pandit Nehru. "India had yet another golden opportunity" says Dr. Raza, "to solve the problem on a permanent basis in 1971. Our Government should have utilized this opportunity to liberate Pakistan-Occupied-Kashmir (POK) and integrate it with Jammu and Kashmir. This opportunity was also missed...As for as Pakistan is concerned, I am of the firm opinion that there can be no talk with that country as long as Islamabad does not stop its aggression in the so-called Azad

Kashmir. I, however, feel that this is not the appropriate time to scrap Article 370. It should be scrapped only after liberation of POK...As for a war with Pakistan, I think it will not be in the interests of the people of both the countries. But since the money-order economy of Pakistan is already doddering and since a hate-India policy is the only way for a government to survive in Islamabad, we should be prepared for the worst." *The Illustrated Weekly of India*, May 13, 1990)

The fifth and the last school of thought is represented by Prof Balraj Madhok, a well-known Jana Sangh leader fully conversant with the history and politics of Jammu and Kashmir, and Syed Sahabuddin, a former diplomat and Member of Parliament, a Janta Dal Leader and convenor Babri Action Committee. There is, however, a minor variation between the two. The views of Prof Balraj Madhok on Kashmir and its problem are well-known. His books and recent articles on Kashmir, published in the national and local papers, such as *The Hindu*, *The Statesman*, *The Hindustan Times* and *The Daily Excelsior*, on July 3, July 7, June 20 and July 22, 1990, respectively, give a clear idea as to his thinking and views on Kashmir.

Like Dr. Rahi Masoom Raza and others, Prof. Madhok is making it loud and clear that Kashmir Valley is an integral part of India all through the ages. "Kashmir is not a foreign land outside India. Self-determination for it or for any other part of India is" out of question. He, in unambiguous terms, opines that motivation of secessionists and terrorists in the Valley is "religio-political and not economic." Economically Kashmir has become an "basis of affluence" in the Jammu and Kashmir State which is a very small part of the State. There can be no dialogue, says Prof. Balraj Madhok, with the terrorists and secessionists. Political process can start only after the authority of the State is fully established. The first thing to be done after that is to remove the widespread feeling among the Kashmiri Muslims that Kashmir is not a part of India and that its future has to be decided. "The only effective way to abrogate this impression is to abrogate Article 370, and extend Indian Constitution in full to the State."

Prof. Balraj Madhok has added yet another dimension to the solution of the Kashmir problem. He opines that the abrogation of Article 370 "should be followed by re-organisation of the State so as to give statehood to Kashmir and Jammu and Union Territory status to Ladakh with internal autonomy like other States. This will safeguard Kashmiri identity and satisfy the aspirations of the people of Jammu and Ladakh. They must also be heard."

Syed Sahabuddin, like Prof. Madhok, wants Kashmir to be a part of India. He is of the firm opinion that the "long-term future" and welfare of the Kashmiris "still lay with India." "But sometimes it occurs to me that we are going downhill very fast. In my view the State of Jammu and Kashmir was an accident of history. It has no inherent unity. The compulsions and aspirations of Jammu and Ladakh are totally different from that of the rest of the Valley, and if the country is in no mood to give a very special status, let us limit it to the Valley, which will mean then that the State of Jammu and Kashmir can be trifurcated. Jammu can broadly be a part of a Vishal Himachal Pradesh or be a separate State. Ladakh can be a Union Territory. The problem then is limited to the Valley, and finding out what will finally be acceptable to the people of the Valley, short of independence."

Syed Sahabuddin further opines that the Indians as a nation cannot and must not accept the right of self-determination as is advocated by the Kashmiris, and shall not concede 'Azadi' to the Valley, but why can't Kashmir enjoy a degree of autonomy which its people can never hope to have in a Muslim Pakistan? In a Muslim Pakistan, says Sahabuddin, the Kashmiris will be absorbed as sugar dissolve in milk and that their identity and ethnicity will not be honoured. He argues with full force that a very clear and fundamental contradiction exists between what Kashmiris want and what Pakistan wishes. Pakistan wants the conquest of Kashmir, with or without plebiscite. The Kashmiris, on the contrary, want self-determination, and this self-determination the people of the Valley interpret as 'Azadi' or political emancipation from India and non-interference of Pakistan.

Elaborating his point or thesis, Syed Sahabuddin expresses that if the Indian Government offers something to the Kashmiris which is much more than they can hope to obtain from Pakistan, and if it ultimately carries conviction with them that international configuration of forces would, under no circumstances, allow the Kashmiris to have 'Azadi', than probably a political dialogue between the Indian Government and the Kashmiris may result into a mutually agreed solution. However, like Chandra Shekhar Hari Kishan Singh Surjeet and others holding similar views, Syed Sahabuddin is for the retention of Article 370 for he is of the firm opinion that the moment the Indian Government scrap Article 370, the best opportunity for any agreement with the Kashmiris would be lost and would be lost for ever. This is the differences in approach towards Kashmir between Prof. Madhok and Sahabuddin.

The observations of Syed Sahabuddin that the State of Jammu and Kashmir was an accident of history, that it has no inherent unity and that the aspirations, compulsions and needs of the people of Jammu and Ladakh are totally different from those of the Kashmiris need some elucidation.

The following few points will make it abundantly clear that there exists sharp and fundamental contradictions between Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh which are making a settlement with Kashmir almost impossible :

- (1) The people of Jammu and Ladakh want full integration with India. They not only welcome but also advocate extension of Central laws to the State. On the contrary the protagonists of the pre-1953 political set up and the Kashmir-based National Conference leadership regard all such changes as an erosion of Article 370.
- (2) Take, for instance, the appointment of Jagmohan as the Governor of Jammu and Kashmir State in January 1990. What happened then in the State? Jammu hailed Jagmohan's appointment by bursting crackers and distributing sweets, while the same was assailed by the Natio-

nal Conference leadership excluding the NC leaders belonging to the Jammu Province and led to Farooqi's resignation from the Chief-Ministership. Contradictory was the response of the people of Jammu and Kashmir when Jagmohan was recalled in May. Jammu observed *bandh* for four days, whereas the militants and the national Conference leaders of the Valley celebrated the exit of Jagmohan as a day of deliverance and thanksgiving.

- (3) Jammu and Ladakh advocate the necessity and importance of one constitution, one flag and one president. The people of these two regions see in the Indian Constitution provisions which can satisfy and promote their politico-economic and social aspirations. They are, in addition, rabidly opposed to the restoration of pre-1953 political set-up and Kashmiris' fight for freedom.

The National Conference leadership belonging to the Valley not only wants a constitution different from that of the Indian Constitution but also advocates the acceptance of the 1952 Delhi Agreement which provided for limited accession of Jammu and Kashmir to the Indian Union or the restoration of the 1953 political-arrangement. The Kashmiri militants, on the other hand, are determined to sever the Valley's all links with India. They are working on two options : (a) to join Pakistan or (b) to remain independent of India and Pakistan. In other words, while Jammu and Ladakh appear determined to snap their political ties with Kashmir, the Valley seems determined to snap its political and other links with India.

- (4) While Jammu and Ladakh firmly believe that the accession of the State to the Indian Union is final and irrevocable, the National Conference leaders of the Valley and the protagonists of 'Azadi' or Pakistan advocate solution to the Kashmir problem under the 1948-49 UN resolu-

tions and the 1972 Shimla Agreement believing that the Kashmir issue is still wide open.

- (5) While national parties, like the Congress-I, the Janta Dal and the BJP are being rejected by the Kashmiris, the National Conference of Kashmir which ruled the State from 1947 to 65 and again from 1975 to January 1990, is looked down upon by the Jammuites and Ladakhis.
- (6) The human rights champions are eulogized in Kashmir but they are being condemned in Jammu in outright terms for their alleged anti-India activities. Who doesn't know the rough treatment meted out to certain human rights champions at the India Coffee House, Jammu, on May 2, 1990, where M.M. Khajuria and Myself had to intervene to save the champions from a certain physical assault.
- (7) The memorandum submitted by 137 Kashmiri officials to the "People of the World" against the alleged repression, violation of human rights in Kashmir during Jagmohan's second tenure of Governorship from January 1990 to May 1990, and a support of the militants' cause evoked condemnation from Jammu officials.
- (8) When the State Secretariat was in Jammu last winter, the employees belonging to the Valley organised demonstrations and dharnas inside the Secretariat premises to pressurise the Government to send them back to the Valley. Now the employees hailing from Jammu and working in Srinagar Secretariat are demanding their immediate return to Jammu.
- (9) The three-day strike by the Jammu and Kashmir Government employees from July 23 was participated in full by the 1.37 Lakh Kashmiri employees, including the Additional Chief Secretary, Secretaries to the Government and other high officials. The strike was total in Kashmir. On the other hand, the strike evoked Zero response in Jammu and Ladakh regions.

The expectations of the leadership spearheading the strike that the people of Doda, Poonch and Rajouri in the Jammu region and Kargil in Ladakh will participate in strength was belied by the nationalists of the referred to districts. Instead, the leadership got rebuff from trade unions and other bodies. Majid Khan, President All Jammu and Kashmir Low Paid Employees Association, and Abdul Majid, President Jammu Muslim Front, flayed the Kashmiri leadership in unequivocal terms and assured the Government their unstinted and unqualified support and co-operation. And

- (10) The people of Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh belong to different social customs and literatures and different philosophies based on conflicting ideas and conceptions. It is quite obvious that the people of Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh derive their inspiration from different sources of history. They have different herces and different episodes. Very often the hero of the one is quite the opposite of the other. To yoke together such people under single State must lead to a growing discontent and final destruction of any system that may be so built for the governance of such State.

I conclude by saying that solution to the Kashmir imbroglio lies only in the immediate abrogation of Article 370, outright rejection of the 1948-49 UN resolutions and the 1972 Shimla Agreement, integration of POK with India and trifurcation of the State into Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh States. The sooner it is done, the better. Generating more employment, encouraging investment or development in the Valley won't do.

The presence of so many contradictions between the people of Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh, the adherence to the Shimla Agreement and the Pak's occupation of the so-called Azad Kashmir are the basic problems. The solution to these problems is not very difficult. What is required is determination, firmness and statesmanship. While the trifurcation of the State will

eliminate the possibility of dangerous role of many a contradiction between different regions and would promote sound and healthy politics based on democratic and economic issues there, the rejection of the UN resolutions and the Shimla Agreement and the re-occupation of the POK would settle the Kashmir issue once for all making Srinagar and Islamabad believe that they would no more be allowed any undue latitude endangering the unity, integrity and sovereignty of India. ('Kashmir Crisis a Commentary', *Daily Excelssior*, August 10-14, 1990).

The Fiasco

Deeply shocked and perturbed over the ongoing secessionist militancy in the Valley of Kashmir, many a sophisticated journalist and writer and well-meaning person have laboured hard to analyse its genesis and suggest possible solutions to overcome it. Certain top-ranking defence personnels have also made their valuable opinion on the Kashmir curse public through their analytical writings. The prominent among those who have devoted their precious time and attention to the crisis in Kashmir include Prof. Balraj Madhok ('Kashmir Crisis : Facts and Suggestions', *Daily Excelsior*, Jammu, July 22, 1990), B. Krishna (Kashmir : Clouded By Myth', *The Hindu*, Madras, August 17, 1990), Colonel J.K. Dutt ('Choice In Kashmir : No Escape From Hard Reality', *The Statesman*, Calcutta, August 31, 1990), Dr. Karan Singh ('Jammu And Kashmir : No Time To loose', *The Hindustan Times*, New Delhi, September 1, 1990) and Brig. Rai Singh ('Kashmir : Learn From Errors', *The Indian Express*, New Delhi, September 19, 1990). The latest to join them is O.N. Dhar ('Kashmir : Illusions And Reality', *The Hindustan Times*, October 2, 1990).

Opinion Divided

While Professor Balraj Madhok, B. Krishana and Col. J.K. Dutt hold Jawaharlal Nehru the first Prime Minister of Independent India, responsible for whatever has happened

and still happening in the strategic Jammu and Kashmir State, Brig. Rai Singh finds the genesis of the ongoing separatist movement in the 1987 Rajiv-Farooq Accord. Brig. Rai Singh opines in unambiguous terms that "the genesis of the present unhappy situation in Kashmir can be traced back to the time the Congress-I joined the National Conference (NC) Government under Dr. Farooq Abdullah. The former, in its keenness to share power, deprived the State of an opposition which in its wake, gradually but surely resulted in the total collapse of administration. The pro-Pak elements, especially the youth among them, admirably aided, abetted, trained, armed and guided by Pakistan, fully exploited the chaotic conditions, with impunity. Even a casual visitor to the Valley during the period could sense it. With the presence of the Army, the paramilitary forces and a plethora of intelligence agencies in Kashmir, it is inconceivable that the governments at the Centre and in the State did not know what was happening under their nose. Of course, they were fully in the picture but the easy-going Chief Minister sheltered under the protective umbrella of a friendly Prime Minister, simply closed his eyes to the drift."

Any impartial investigator who who would study and analyse the writings of Mehr Chand Mahajan, Sardar Patel, V. P. Menon, Balraj Madhok and Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerjee would agree with the thesis that "The perpetrator of the Kashmir curse was none other than Jawaharlal Nehru." Even a superficial study and examination of the opinion expressed by many a nationalist leader, including Gulzari Lal Nanda and Acharya Kriplani, would also suggest a somewhat similar theory. One also feels compelled to agree with J.K. Dutt's conclusions some of which are :

- (1) Kashmiris were allowed to believe that they were a race apart from the rest of the country;
- (2) They (Kashmiries) were also given to believe that the rest of India could be sacrificed for them;
- (3) That Kashmir had to be looked after no matter what

the cost and

- (4) That in order to give a modicum of legal coverage, the infamous article 370 was introduced and thereby began our (Indians') tale of woe.

However, one may or may not fully agree with some of other observations of Dutt. Dutt's sweeping statements and observations which certainly need an objective analysis are :

- (a) In all probability, the so-called Kashmir problem would not have arisen at all, if India's first Prime Minister had not been a die-hard Kashmiri;
- (b) Nehru had two overwhelming weaknesses—the British and Kashmir;
- (c) Nehru's blind parochialism towards Kashmir and things Kashmiri was also unbelievable;
- (d) In his heart of hearts he (Nehru) identified himself as a Kashmiri first and an Indian afterwards or to amend Shakespeare, it was not that he loved India less but that he loved Kashmir more;
- (e) While condemning a partheid in South Africa, Nehru encouraged it in Kashmir;
- (f) He (Nehru) made sure that Kashmir was not polluted by other Indians, like Hindus, Shikhs, Jains, and so on; and
- (g) That the fundamental theme that Nehru wanted for Kashmir was that the Kashmiri Muslims and Kashmiri Pandits combine must be kept separate from everything else.

Deeply hurt and provoked by Col. Dutt's observations, O.N. Dhar fired a salvo by issuing, what may be termed as testimonial containing all possible praises—which one could shower-for Nehru. That the observations against Nehru provoked and irritated Dhar is reflected from the harsh language he has used against Dutt while defending and

culogizing Nehru. Without making any attempt at analysing the genesis of the secessionist movement in Kashmir and suggesting possible solution to diffuse the situation as it exists today, Dhar has sought to refute and counter Dutt's observations against Nehru and his love for Kashmir and Kashmiris and the unlimited latitude he allowed lord Mountbatten, the nominated governor-general of India—latitude that emboldened the latter to placate at the cost of India his Pakistani counterpart, Mohd. Ali Jinnah, by offering a plebiscite in Kashmir without prior permission of the Union Government and then by making the head of Indian Government take India's internal matter to the United Nations (U.N.).

While Dhar accused Dutt of ill-will or hatred for Nehru and Kashmiris, he himself refused to be objective and unbiased. Three of his many observations will be enough to conclude that Dhar has completely failed in presenting a true picture of facts. Firstly, "Dealing with Kashmir was not, therefore, merely a question of negotiating with the ruler as was the case in most other States. For India to harness and sustain the pro-Indian spirit of the Muslim masses in the Valley, it was essential to keep up the rapport with the political leadership developed by the Congress under Nehru over a period of many years through shared struggles and fostering of a close kinship of ideals". Secondly, "It was Nehru's vision and his commitment to the basic ideals of India that attracted Kashmir—despite its overwhelming Muslim majority—to India and if this country succeeds in retaining it as a part and parcel of the Republic, it will be because of the secular democratic legacy left by him. . . ." And thirdly, "the decision to have the ceasefire (during the first Indo-Pak war of 1947-48) was thus dictated not only by strong strategic considerations but also by sagacious political perceptions."

In fact, Dhar's writing has made the confusion about the national sensitive issue further confounded and can be termed as something totally biased.

While one can understand Dhar's appreciation for Nehru and Venom for Dutt, one fails to comprehend as to what pro-

mpted Dr. Karan Singh to develop a strange thesis on Kashmir crisis—its origin and solution. Completely ignoring the serious political explosions that have been rocking the State right from October 26, 1947, he has placed the entire responsibility of the present separatist movement on the shoulders of the National Front (NF) Government which assumed the reins of the Indian administration towards the end of 1980. The conclusions Dr. Karan Singh has drawn appear strange all the more because he is one of those who have been parties to many a decision affecting the politics of the state and also because right from the day one when the state acceded to the Indian Union, he remained associated with the State political affairs one way or the other. One wonders, when Dr. Karan Singh says : "The situation (in Kashmir) deteriorated rapidly after the National Front Government assumed office. . . Before that, whatever be the weaknesses and shortcomings of the coalition Government headed by Dr. Farooq Abdullah, and there were many, it at least provided a framework for political and economic activity, and the law and order situation also was generally under control. . . The reappointment of Mr. Jagmohan as the Governor gave Dr. Farooq Abdullah the occasion to quietly withdraw from the scene, thus nullifying the only major pro-India party in the Valley. . . ."

Had Dr. Karan Singh evaluated all the political events, his findings would have been certainly different, sound and acceptable. After all who knows better than Dr. Karan Singh himself ?

Sharp contradictions in some of the writings appeared in the national press during the last one year or so clearly reflect authors' confused perception of the Kashmir problem. In the absence of clear perception, all exercises in finding out lasting and rational solution to the tangle would certainly be meaningless and would certainly create more confusion.

To arrive at logical conclusion, one is required to evaluate methodically and objectively each and every political event that Jammu and Kashmir witnessed between October 26, 1947,

and October 1990. It must be borne in mind that the poison of separation, subversion and anti-India activities was injected at the time of accession itself. Whatever followed was and is the outcome of the political blunders committed between October 1947 and July 1952. While in October 1947 the question of the State accession was mishandled, in 1948 the centre referred the Kashmir issue to the UN. The story of blunders did not end here. To make the matter more complex, Article 370 was incorporated in the Indian constitution isolating the people of the State from the rest of the Country. This uncalled for blunder took place in 1949. Whatever was still left was destroyed in 1952 when the Centre under the Nehru-Sheikh Accord accepted the State's limited accession.

In addition any study which does not include Jammu and Ladakh in its broad framework and does not evaluate the impact of inter-regional relations on the overall situation would remain incomplete helping in no way to solve the Kashmir imbroglio, the Jammu tangle and the Ladakh impasse. Indeed, any such study would create more problems than it would solve.

Accession

How did the story of Kashmir crisis and Jammu-Ladakh woes start? Who were the heroes and trouble-makers in the story?

How did the people of Kashmir view Article 370? Did Article 370 achieve "independence" for Kashmir and Kashmiris? Did it bring Kashmir in the mainstream politics?

The story of Kashmir crisis, neglect of Jammu and Ladakh and exploitation of the rest of India commenced when on October 26, 1947, Mehr Chand Mahajan, the then Prime Minister of Jammu and Kashmir, went to New Delhi to meet Nehru and other Central leaders to discuss the situation arising out of the Pak aggression in Kashmir and negotiate the State's accession to the India Dominion. Accompanying him was V.P. Menon whom the Defence Committee presided

over by Lord Mountbatten had sent to Srinagar" to study the situation on-the-spot and to report to the Government of India". Mahajan carried with him the Instrument of Accession document which was duly signed by Maharaja Hari Singh. He met Nehru to negotiate the State accession to India as per the June 3, 1947, Mountbatten Plan. In the course of the confabulations held between the two Prime Ministers, tempers ran very high. The question under discussion was the Hari Singh's request for an immediate military support to defend the "all out invasion of Kashmir" started on October 22, 1947. The Pakistani aggression was, it must be said, aimed at grabbing Jammu and Kashmir or seeking its forced accession to Pakistan Dominion.

Mahajan vigorously pleaded with Nehru that the Indian military help should be immediately sent to the Valley, for Kashmir was in an imminent danger of falling a victim to Pakistan's evil design. To the forceful pleadings Nehru "unrealistically retorted : "India was strong enough to retake it". This casual, light-hearted and candid reply, obviously, disappointed and dismayed Mahajan and took Sardar Patel by surprise.

It may sound strange but it is a hard fact of history that Nehru did not pay any heed to Hari Singh's request. Rather he dismissed it with a shake of head. His reasoning : "This may not be logistically possible and seemed to be dependent on the advice tendered by the British Commander-in-Chief of the Army, as it did happen in Hyderabad operations later. Nehru's hesitancy was typical of the one he displayed at the time of such operations : still later when Goa action took place : to do or not to do split his mind".

Nehru's attitude compelled Mahajan to say that, "in the event of the request being not conceded, he had the Maharaja's instructions to go to Lahore and negotiate with Mohd. Ali Jinnah," the Pakistani Governor general, and Liaquat Ali Khan, the Premier. Mahajan's remarks provoked Nehru. He, in anger, retorted: "Mahajan, you may go". Under those

tense moments, Mahajan had no other option left but to part company with Nehru abandoning discussion on the issue. When he was about to leave Nehru's room, Sardar Patel intervened and said: "Mahajan, You are not going to Pakistan". Just at that eventful moment, a servant entered Nehru's room bringing with him a small slip from the adjoining room where Sheikh Mohd. Abdullah was camping. As soon as Nehru read that magical slip, his already red face "lit up". Overwhelmed, overpowered and relaxed, Nehru reflected "Sheikh Sahib says the same thing". The magical slip played the magic and question which a few minutes before had generated intense heat got solved. Without further debate and argument, Nehru agreed to help the State against Pakistan's unprovoked and illegal war. Thereafter the things moved fast and the very next morning the airlift commenced.

Here it is pertinent to mention that the partition agreement according to which the Muslim dominated areas of British India were to be detached to constitute a Muslim Pakistan did not include 540 and odd princely states. The June 3, 1947, Mountbatten Plan, declaring the lapse of paramountcy, had empowered the rulers of Indian India to Join or not any of the two dominions, i.e., India and Pakistan, in view of the considerations of geographical contiguity. And it was certainly this consideration which had made Junagarh and Hyderabad to join the Indian Dominion. Both of these princely states were not contiguous to Pakistan and were surrounded on all sides by the Indian Dominion.

In fact, Kachh, Jodhpur, Bikaner, Bahawalpur and Jammu and Kashmir were the five princely States which could exercise a choice as per the June 3, Plan. The simple reason being that all these states were contiguous to India and Pakistan. Kachh (Gujrat), Jodhpur and Bikaner (Rajasthan) were the Hindu majority state, and so they acceded to the Indian Dominion. Bahawalpur was a muslim majority state and so it joined Pakistan. The case of Jammu and Kashmir was, however, altogether different and somewhat complex. It had an overall muslim majority. But its eastern regions of Jammu

and Ladakh, which were contiguous to India, had (and still have) Hindu and Buddisht majority, respectively.

Yet another equally important and relevant point to be considered is that the Instrument of Accession Mahajan carried to New Delhi was similar to ones signed by other rulers of princely India. The moment the Government of India accepted the accession as per the provisions specified, Jammu and Kashmir State became an integral part of India. Accession under this Instrument was full, final, unconditional, irrevocable and non-negotiable.

Still another aspect of the accession story that needs to be highlighted is Jawaharlal Nehru's different approach towards the State of Jammu and Kashmir. When the "question of accession of princely States arose, Nehru was petrified that Sardar Patel should handle his beloved Kashmir in the same way in which he handled all others." Nehru did not allow Sardar Patel to interfere in Jammu and Kashmir. Had Sardar Patel handled the Kashmir issue, he would certainly have adopted an objective, national and rational approach and solved the so-called problem in India's favour in 1947 itself. In fact, on March 8, 1948, Sardar Patel had told Prof. Balraj Madhok that he would "set things right in Kashmir in one month if he was asked to tackle it. But he would not interfere so long as the issue remained in Nehru's charge."

SHEIKH FAVOURED ACCESSION

Why did the Sheikh favour Jammu and Kashmir's accession to India? This is the mystery which catches every body's imagination. Fortunately, however, one can solve this mystery by going into the November 1947 interview the Sheikh gave to Ian Stephens, the then Editor of *the Statesman*. On the lawns of the Nedou's Hotel, Srinagar, the Sheikh told Ian Stephens that, "if they (Pakistani invaders) had to attack, Mr. Stephens, why in Heaven's sake couldn't they go to Poonch to help the people there against the autocrat (Hari Singh)? Why must they rush towards Srinagar, looting and burning? Ian Stephens explains: "As a Kashmiri with ancestral recollec-

tions of previous incursions up the same route, he had felt personally outraged". More than that Sheikh Abdullah had the "mortal fear of elimination at the hands Jinnah and Liaquat Ali Khan." Of the Sheikh, Jinnah had contemptuously observed. "Oh ! THAT TALL MAN WHO SINGS THE Kuran and exploits the people (the Kashmiri Muslims)". Liaquat Ali Khan, on the otherhand, called the Sheikh : "This quisling-an agent of the Congress for many years" who "struts about the stage bartering the life, honour and freedom of the people for the sake of personal profit and power."

Sheikh Abdullah achieved both "profit and power through Nehru's generous, unchecked support by cleverly comouflag-ing his real motive." His real motive was nothing but "independence". This become crystal clear on October 27, 1947. When he in unequivocal terms declared at Srinagar : "We have picked up the Crown of Kashmir from dust. The Question of joining India or Pakistan can wait. We have to complete our independence first."

Intrigue

No sooner did the Sheikh assume charge of the State administration, he started changing colours and eliminating everyone who in his opinion was inconvenient. He first got rid of the "inconvenient Mahajan" as Prime Minister of the State, and soon after created a situation quite unfavourable for Hari Singh with a view to secure his exile. And ultimately, he did secure that. Alarmed, Patel pleaded with Nehru that India's presence in Jammu and Kashmir was primarily and entirely owing to the Maharaja's decision of throwing in the lot of the State subjects with the rest of the Indians, but with no result.

Article 370

In addition, the Sheikh manipulated differential and preferential treatment for Kashmir and Kashmiris. Repeatedly, he demanded special favours from the Indian government in the name of "Muslims of the Valley" or "the Muslim Charac-

ter" of the State. Deputation after deputation was despatched to New Delhi to influence the Indian government. The deputationists sought and got a large number of concessions, including a separate Constitution, a separate Prime Minister and a separate Flag for the State. The National Conference (NC) under the able guidance of the Sheikh made the Central Government accept different designations for the heads of the State and the Government. The head of the State was to be called Sadr-e-Riasat, whereas the head of the Government was to be styled Waziriaazam. Deeply indoctrinated by the arguments of the N.C. leaders, the Congress leadership controlled by an all powerful Nehru went to the extent of incorporating the separatist Article 370 in the Indian Constitution to safeguard what was described as "Special Condition". It would not be an exaggeration to mention here that the Sheikh and his close lieutenants obliged Nehru to accept all of their unreasonable demands, in complete disregard to the forceful views of some of his own ministerial colleagues and the Known public opinion of Jammuities and Ladakhis, who were advocating full and complete integration of the State with the rest of the country.

The treatment meted out to the Sheikh and his NC soon produced dangerous results. The Sheikh and his associates started treating India and the Indians with contempt. The situation came to a head when the Sheikh's attitude towards Nehru underwent a radical change. The change was all the more significant because whatever he had achieved, he had achieved it by exploiting Nehru. What could have been more humiliating and insulting for Nehru than that the Sheikh should stop acknowledging his letters and listening to his sermons. And a despairing Nehru, according to Acharya Kriplani, would remark : "Kashmir is lost to us". The remark that Nehru made that "Kashmir is lost to us" unambiguously proves that he "bemoaned his own face, rather than that of India". Nehru was, in fact, personally responsible for committing two political blunders. Firstly, Nehru equated Kashmir with Sheikh Abdullah and thereby allowed him to become a wall of separatism, sedition, suspicion and hatred

between the Kashmiri Muslims and India. And secondly, he, as Prime Minister of India, miserably failed in establishing a direct and personal rapport with the Kashmiri population.

Obviously, in such a situation and vacuum, the Kashmiri muslim "simple, unsophisticated minds" were fascinated and indoctrinated with a false sense of their "independence" the Sheikh achieved for them under Article 370. How did the Kashmiri muslims view Article 370? to what extent did the Kashmiri Muslims achieve political emancipation under 370? The answer for both the questions lies in the ongoing upsurge in Kashmir for "Azadi". However, for the Sheikh and his family and a few associates and collaborators of his Article 370 did achieve "Azadi". The Article certainly paid Sheikh Abdullah rich to keep everything undefined and absolutely vague. He, however, at the same time, could not afford to be Pro-Pakistani, for that would have culminated in his destruction first. It can be authoritatively asserted that if anything, the Article had made Sheikh Abdullah the de-facto power and an arbitrator.

Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerjee, who after resigning. (He was the first Cabinet Minister of free India to resign on a matter of policy) from the Union Cabinet on April 8, 1950, had formed the Bhartiya Jana Sangh on October 21, 1951, had dwelt at length on Article 370 in one of his speeches and had asked: "How is Kashmir going to be integrated with India? Is Kashmir going to be a republic within a republic? Are we thinking of another sovereign parliament within the four corners of India barring this sovereign parliament?" During the course of his powerful speech, Mookerjee also warned? "If you just want to play with the winds and say we are helpless and let Sheikh Abdullah do what he likes then Kashmir would be lost."

To awaken all the parliamentarians and those who matter in shaping and moulding government policies, Mookerjee referred to what Patel had repeatedly said about the basis, the background and necessity of integrating all the acceding States

fully with no special rights whatsoever and posed pointed questions : "Are not the people of Jammu and Kashmir entitled to the fundamental rights that we have given to the people of India minus the Jammu and Kashmir ? Who made Sheikh Abdullah the king of Kings in Kashmir ?" He himself answered the questions by saying : "it is because Indian troops went there. Did we do it for creating a sovereign republic within a sovereign republic ?"

In fact, Mookerjee had declared in unequivocal terms that there was no scope for varied constitutional patterns and disparities between one federating unit and another. He had urged upon Nehru to fully assert and declare that "we do not want this kind of Kashmiri nationalism. We do not want this sovereign Kashmir idea". Mookerjee was fully convinced of the fact that if India "start doing it in Kashmir, others also will demand it (independence)". However, as a *via media*, Mookerjee suggested that "if Sheikh Abdulla insists upon a limited accession by Kashmir, then at any rate let us devise a scheme by which the people of Jammu and Ladakh may have full liberty whether they will or will not integrate fully".

The crux of the firm stand Mookerjee had taken lay enshrined in his letter to Nehru, dated February 3, 1953. He wrote that the question of accession of Jammu and Kashmir should not be allowed to hang fire. Nehru's reply to Mookerjee's letter was rather intriguing and astonishing. Nehru condemned the Praja Parishad and its approach towards Kashmir as parochial, communal and destructive. He referred to the external complications it might lead to. The can did reply of Nehru provoked Mookerjee to write to him yet another letter on February 8, 1953, touching upon the demand of the Praja Parishad that the entire state of Jammu and Kashmir be governed by the same constitution that applied to all others and asking: "Is there anything communal or reactionary or anti-national about it ? If India's constitution is good enough for the rest of India, why should it not be acceptable to the State of Jammu and Kashmir. It is amazing how the move of the Sheikh and his colleagues is being

applauded by you as national and patriotic and the genuine desire on the part of the Praja Parishad to secure the fundamental unity and integrity of India and to be governed as common Indian citizens is being dubbed as treacherous."

It needs to be emphasized that the inclusion of Article 370 had become a subject of hot debate in the Constituent Assembly of India itself. Maulana Hasrat Mohini, a great poet and member of the Constituent Assembly, had raised his voice against the move and wanted to know as to why such discrimination was being allowed in favour of Jammu and Kashmir State. Replying on behalf of the government of India, Dr. Gopalaswami Ayanger had said : "This discrimination is due to special conditions in Kashmir. It is the hope of everyone here that in due course even Jammu and Kashmir will become ripe for the same sort of integration as has taken place in the case of other State." All the efforts put in by a number of members of the Constituent assembly to convince the Nehru's Government of the undesirability and dangerous consequences the Article would generate failed to carry conviction and thus a seed of separation and secessionism was sown the bitter fruits of which we are sadly reaping everyday.

Plebiscite

Apart from Article 370 which to a great extent kept the Kashmiri Muslims aloof from the rest of India and contributed towards Kashmir's alienation, a step in that direction had been taken in 1947 itself by the two highly misconceived moves on the part of Lord Mountbatten, the nominated Governor-General of India. He was a Britisher who bore the responsibility of India's partition on the basis of Two-nation theory, and moreover, he was merely free India's nominated Governor-General "with no plenipotentiary powers." It is, therefore, intriguing and rather surprising that a Britisher should have been allowed unlimited latitude by Jawaharlal Nehru to go to Lahore to meet Mohammad Ali Jinnah, his Pakistani counter-part, on November 1, 1947, all by himself and offer him on his own a plebiscite in Jammu and Kashmir

State to ascertain people's opinion on the political future of the State.

Two most significant points emerge from what Lord Mountbatten did in Lahore during his meeting with Jinnah on the day i.e. ; November 1, 1947. First, Mountbatten "thought of plebiscite while in flight from New Delhi to Lahore, and not earlier." Secondly, it was primarily a British sop at India's cost to calm down Jinnah's rage over General Gracey's (Gracey was the Acting Commander-in-Chief of the Pakistan Army.) outright refusal to obey his orders to march troops into the Valley of Kashmir. It is important to note that Field-Marshal Auchinleck had on October 28 gone to Lahore to meet Jinnah and discuss the situation arising out of Gracey's refusal to order army's march into Kashmir without the approval of the Supreme Commander. Auchinleck pacified Jinnah. But Jinnah asked Auchinleck that he should ask Lord Mountbatten and Nehru to meet him at Lahore to discuss the Kashmir problem.

Lord Mountbatten was very eager that the Jinnah's invitation should be accepted and that he and Nehru should go to Lahore. But Sardar Patel was strongly opposed to "either of them making a visit". He said that, "as Pakistan was the aggressor in this case, it was not right to follow a policy of appeasement by running after Jinnah. Nehru was inclined to agree with Mountbatten. He argued that we had not gone to Kashmir for territorial acquisition and if we could find a peaceful solution of the problem we should not stand on prestige."

What was indeed shocking was Mountbatten's offer of plebiscite and that, too, "without Jinnah's asking for it." It was Mountbatten's offer and Nehru's non-opposition to it which gave a "Muslim Pakistan a finger in the Kashmir pie—indeed, an opportunity to rake up the issue whenever it was suitable." Right from November 1, 1947, Pakistani rulers are raising the Kashmir issue off and on. The December 1989 declaration by Ghulam Ishaq Khan, President of Pakistan,

that his country" would continue calling for a plebiscite in exercise of, what he called, inherent right of self-determination" of the people of the State amply proves the point.

Mountbatten's second major anti-India and pro-Pakistani act, with equally serious implications, was obliging Nehru to take the issue of Pakistan's aggression on Indian territory in Kashmir to the United Nations. "He got this done in a haste lest Sardar Patel should come back and upset his apple-cart. He did not want Junagadh to be repeated. And Sardar's absence from New Delhi was just for five days or so". On his return to Delhi, Sardar Patel "Synically remarked : even a district court pleader will not go as a complainant". He condemned the Security Council as "insecurity council and a disturber of peace."

Here Col. Datt's observation that "Whatever the British said was gospel truth for him (Nehru) and no power on earth could dissuade him from accepting their advice irrespective of whether such advice was in the interest of the country or not" appears quite reasonable. The extent to which Nehru's obsession with the British and everything British transcended everything else was evident from that one classic example during the first Indo-Pak War (1947-48). The Indian Army and Air Force was much better organized as compared with the Pak Army and Air Force at that time, particularly in view of the fact that the partition had just taken place and Pakistan had yet to organise and consolidate itself. The Indian Commanders such as Lt. Colonel Dewan Ranjit Rai of the Sikh battalion, Major General Kalwant Singh, Major General K.S. Thimmayya and Major-General Atma Singh had fully realised this. They were anxious to exploit the Pak weakness to the maximum extent. The better and intelligent strategy soon brought the Pakistani forces on the verge of a humiliating defeat "which, unfortunately, did not serve the purpose of the British."

Mountbatten, ably backed by Generals Gracie and Meservy (C-in-C of the Indian Army) advised Nehru to refer the

issue to the UN. Just when the Indian Army was about to inflict a crushing defeat on Pakistan, Nehru ordered a ceasefire. And if the Indian forces got dumbfounded, it was quite natural. No amount of reasoning and pleading could influence Nehru's decision. He declared in clear terms that ceasefire had to be implemented. Nehru's "obstinacy" Thus proved fatal for the national cause. India lost the golden opportunity "to settle the Kashmir issue once and for all" in India's favour. The unwanted ceasefire was implemented helping Pakistan to heave a sigh of relief. In fact, Nehru's rigid attitude helped Pakistan to convert its certain defeat into a grand victory. Pakistan got India's territory, now called the so-called Azad Kashmir, whereas India lost it and now calls it Pakistan-Occupied-Kashmir (POK).

Nehru had to repent for the mistakes he had committed under the directives and inspiration of Lord Mountbatten. Had he gone by the advice of Sardar Patel and respected the will of Mahatma Gandhi, the father of the nation, he would not have taken India's internal matter to the United Nations providing an avoidable opportunity to the Western World to play their nefarious games in the Indo-Pak arena. In addition, Jawaharlal Nehru would not have added what may be termed as an anti-India rider of "referring to the people of Kashmir" the question of the State accession to the Indian Union, once the condition "stabilised and aggression was vacated". That Jawaharlal Nehru himself had realised the dangerous implications of what he had done during 1947-48 became evident when he confessed in early 1949 itself that the Kashmir question "has been raised to an international level by our reference to the Security Council of the United Nations and most of the great powers are intensely interested in what happens in Kashmir." His admissions that the Kashmir issue "has given us a great deal of trouble, that the attitude of the great powers has been astonishing and that some of them have shown active partisanship for Pakistan" indicated the grave danger towards which India was to move in the days to come.

Sheikh's Dispensation

Armed as he was with extraordinary powers, the Sheikh started moving towards dangerous direction. As "disclosed by Michael Davidson in the *Scotsman*, he was dreaming of—and working towards—a Switzerland-type independent Kashmir. For the anti-India activities the Sheikh was indulging in, Nehru had to agree, of course, "reluctantly and painfully", to his arrest on August 9, 1953. He was kept in a government bungalow in the "salubrious climate of 2,100 meters high station", Kodai Kanal, and accorded the treatment of, as per Union Home Minister, Gulzari Lal Nanda's admission, a "special person."

It should be borne in mind that the Sheikh's arrest had not been fully explained, nor treated as such. Hence, it went by default and thereby allowed to be misconceived by the Kashmiri Muslims, with whom he had lost his earlier charisma, popularity and credibility. "They (Kashmiri Muslims) hated the change in his life style from that of a freedom fighter, who had walked along with them shoulder-to-shoulder on dusty village roads, to that of a luxurious living arrogant autocrat who had distanced himself by going about in a big imported Car. There was a dent in the people's implicit faith in him". And very naturally, Nehru had to swallow his earlier words that Sheikh Abdullah was "a very straight forward and frank man". His changed opinion, of course, expressed much later, was: "The Sheikh had indulged in communal activities throughout the period; he had acted as the National Conference leader. It was the Pakistani aggression which had mellowed him a little for a short time, because the tribals had committed gruesome atrocities on the Muslim population in the Valley. But as soon as he became the Prime Minister, he came out in his true colours once again and started anti-Hindu activities . . . His entire outlook and behaviour was based on the fact that the Kashmir Valley had a muslim majority."

Satyagraha

In November 1947, when the All Jammu and Kashmir Praja Parishad came into being largely due to the efforts, of Hari Wazir, Balraj Madhok, Lala Rup Chand Nanda, Pt. Prem Nath Dogra and others, Jammu was passing through critical times as far as its political status was concerned. This condition was the result of the Indian leadership's belief that the Jammuites could be taken for granted believing that their loyalty and allegiance to the country was unquestionable and also of the Centre's increased emphasis on and care for Kashmir and the Kashmiris, arising from the wrong notion that the happiness and contentment of the Kashmiris was the happiness of the Jammuites and the Ladakhis.

Resentful of being grossly ignored and humbled in every walk of life as well as misruled, the Praja Parishad launched a satyagraha against the Sheikh and his anti-Jammu administrative apparatus and the Centre's policy of appeasing and pampering the Kashmiri leadership.

The ground had already been prepared for Satyagraha. The immediate provocation which generated a volcanic situation in Jammu was, of course, the large-scale rejection in 1952 of the nomination papers of the Praja Parishad's candidates seeking election to the Constituent Assembly of the State. As a result of the rejection of the nomination papers and other forms of "repression", the party decided not to participate in the elections. Consequently, the Sheikh's NC secured all the 75 seats without contest. In this situation it was not unnatural that the Praja Parishad should take to other methods to achieve its objective i.e., the State's full integration with India.

The Praja Parishad strongly opposed the provision in the Indian constitution which had awarded Jammu and Kashmir a status different from that of other Indian States. It also condemned the permission granted to the Sheikh to have a constitution other than the Indian Constitution.

This gave rise to the Parishad war cry ;

"Ek Desh Men Do Vidhan, Ek Desh Men do Nishan, Ek Desh Men do Pardhan, Nahin Challenge". (In our country, two constitutions, two flags, two Prime Ministers, will not be tolerated.)

The first demonstration Jammu witnessed was in February 1952. That month the students of G.G.M. Science College came out of the class rooms shouting slogans during a visit of Yuvraj Karan Singh, who had succeeded Hari Singh. The matter, however, came to a head when on April 10, 1952, the Sheikh made a speech at Ranbir Singhpura making it loud and clear that his programme for Kashmir meant "Limited accession at best, i.e. accession in the spheres of defence, foreign affairs and communications", On matters other than these Kashmir was to be at liberty to decide as it wished under its own constitution. It could if so desired extend the areas of accession but "this could only be done at the request of Kashmir". The Sheikh was summoned to New Delhi where he and Nehru entered into an agreement known as the Nehru-Sheikh Accord or the Delhi Agreement. Under this Accord Nehru accepted the Sheikh's demands. Abdullah's only concession was to permit law suits to be appealed from the State High Court to the Supreme Court of India. Otherwise the special status of Jammu and Kashmir was conferred. In other words, "the Sheikh secured the most unreasonable of his demands . . . without conceding anything substantial . . . Every other concession that Shree Nehru has secured is limited by a proviso which almost nullify it."

By now the Praja Parishad had developed close contacts with none other than Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerjee. Accepting the Praja Parishad invitation to attend its meeting at Jammu on August 9 and 10, he declared: "I will secure for you (Jammuites) the Constitution of India or lay down my life for it." The meeting in which Mookerjee, Trivedi and Ram Narain Singh, a Janta Party MP participated adopted an eight-point programme for the acceptance of which the

Satyagraha was to be performed. The party demanded full integration of the State into the Indian Union, or if there was to be limited accession of Kashmir than Jammu and Ladakh should be permitted to integrate fully. The Indian Constitution should be extended to the State in full, the Party asserted. Other demands of the party were (a) extension of the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court; (b) the reconstitution of the State Constituent Assembly and holding of fresh and fair elections to it; (c) elimination of the custom barriers between India and Jammu and Kashmir; (d) adherence to the same "state", "central" and "concurrent list of subjects as the other Indian States and (e) and impartial enquiry into the charges of corruption against the State Government.

With these objects in view, the Praja Parishad launched a full scale satyagraha. The people participated in it in large number and with an exemplary enthusiasm risking their lives.

Ladakh favoured Tibet

In Ladakh, too, the Head Lama of all Ladakh, Kushak Bakula, expressed the opinion that "Kashmir Valley might in case of a UN plebiscite, choose to opt for Pakistan. In that case, there can be no question of Ladakh being dragged into Pakistan . . . Ladakh would join up Tibet . . . The demand is fair as it is democratic. We would also suggest accession for Jammu . . . Facts must be faced. The State of (Jammu and) Kashmir is basically a territory comprising of three linguistic, ethnic, geographic and historic regions. . . The only thing they have in common is their government".

Dispensation Condemned

In Kashmir itself, the Sheikh's government was denounced in unequivocal terms as corrupt. What was even more surprising was the condemnation of the Sheikh's Government formal-administration by a large section of its own left-oriented workers and leaders. Disenchantment with the Sheikh's so-called popular and responsible dispensation soon set in for strong arm methods of governance. As discontent, dissatisfaction

tion and frustration started to simmer, the Sheikh's charisma, popularity and support-base began to erode fast.

Repression

However, it was the Praja Parishad satyagraha which incurred the wrath of the Sheikh. His administration came down heavily on the Parishad's activists culminating in the martyrdom of a number of them. The Sheikh dubbed the satyagraha and the Parishad leaders as communal even though "a large number of Muslims belonging to the Jammu region had participated in it with the same" enthusiasm as their Hindu brothers had done.

Review Accession

The Sheikh's utter failure in crushing the satyagraha and stemming the rot in the State, made him think loudly of getting the State out of the Indian Union. He even went to the extent of eulogizing the new leadership that emerged in Pakistan after the death of Jinnah and Liaquat Ali, his personal enemies. He evolved a new strategy of denegrating India and to persuade the Kashmiri Muslims to believe that their woes and miseries were not due to misrule and corruption but due to the State's accession to the "Hindu India". What was even more worse and dangerous for India and Jammu-Ladakh was the stand he took concerning accession, which by any standard, moral or legal, was complete and non-negotiable. He started telling foreign reporters and even some of "Nehru's" colleagues that the issue of accession needed to be reviewed. The strategy the Sheikh evolved may be termed as political black-mail.

Martyrdom

Yet another event of far reaching consequences that provoked something like a revolt during the first phase of the Sheikh's rule was the death of Mookerjee in Kashmir while under detention. Mookerjee had been arrested on the charge of entering the State without a permit which every non-State Subject was required to obtain for the purpose. Nehru had repeatedly asserted that the accession of the State to the

Indian Union was "hundred per cent complete". Yet it was strange and intriguing to find that one could not enter the Jammu and Kashmir State without a previous permit from the Government of India. "The permit is even granted to communists who are playing their usual role in Jammu and Kashmir, but entry is barred to those who thinks or acts in terms of Indian unity and nationhood".

Mookerjee violated the law and got arrested on May 11, 1953. The Jammu and Kashmir Government order said : "Mookerji has acted, and is acting and is about to act in a manner prejudicial to public safety and peace." The arrest would "prevent him from acting in the aforesaid manner." Also arrested with Mookerji were Guru Dutt Vaidya and Tek Chand. They were taken to Srinagar and lodged in a cottage near the Nishat Bagh where he was to be kept under detention. The three were joined by Prem Nath Dogra, the Parishad President, who was moved from the Central Jail on June 19. Mookerji fell ill shortly after detention. He complained of a pain in his right leg in late May. He developed, a fever and chest pain which were diagnosed on June 22 as "dry pleurisy." That day he was shifted to the state hospital in Srinagar. At about 3.40 A.M. on June 23, he died of a sudden heart attack.

Permit System withdrawn : Mookerki's death and the circumstances surrounded it gave rise to commotion through the country. The permit system was withdrawn later, but only after Mookerjee had sacrificed his precious life for the unity and integrity of India.

Revolt in N.C. The story of Sheikh's strong arm methods of administration, his dwindling popularity and his anti-national stand did not end here. The more the people, including his own men, condemned the Sheikh's role and his administration, the more obstinate and anti-India he turned. Under the circumstances, it was quite natural that prominent National Conference leaders, like Bakshi Ghulam Mohd, G.M. Sadiq, D.P. Dhar and Maulana Sayeed should resent Sheikh Abdulla's

anti-India activities. They even went to the extent of organising public opinion against what they termed as anti-India stance. The Congress leaders still hoped that Sheikh Abdullah and his National Conference would make a common cause with the rest of the country. A number of congress leaders came to Srinagar to dissuade Sheikh Abdullah from his anti-India activities. But nothing came out of these discussions and parleys. Obstinate and arrogant as he was, Sheikh Abdullah went to the extent of insulting Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, a great freedom fighter and nationalist to the core, publicly at a gathering at Idgah in Srinagar. "He even held secret meeting with foreign diplomats and dignitaries, like the American Ambassador in India, Henderson and Adlai Stevenson." Such activities naturally culminated in grave doubts in the minds of the people. Even the Communist Party of India flayed the Sheikh for playing into the hands of the "Imperialist" powers. People started demanding action against him for his activities which were considered detrimental to the nation's unity as also to that of the State. They demanded his immediate removal from the coveted chair of the Prime Ministership. June and July 1953 saw the Sheikh fulminating against India and playing on anti-India sentiments. The situation reached a climax when he refused to meet Nehru. Probably he thought that the Indian Government would succumb to his pressure tactics and, as earlier, would accept all his demands, however unreasonable they might be'.

Arrest

However, all his pressure tactics failed to carry conviction. Dr. Karan Singh, the Sadar-e-Riyasat, and the Union Government in consultation with some prominent leaders of the NC decided to dismiss and arrest the Sheikh. On August 9, 1953, the decision was implemented paving way for Bakshi Ghulam Mohd. to rule the State and undo the wrongs committed by his predecessor.

Financial Black-mail

Bakshi devised a number of schemes to bring about around

development and to clear to mess that the Sheikh's dispensation had created. The developmental measures raised people's expectations. They entertained a hope that the new rule would remove poverty and corruption. They also expected the State administration to assure the benefits of the developmental plans for all. However, the expectations of the people remained unfulfilled. Instead, with the new developmental schemes came an extreme form of corruption "infecting every branch and every part of the State politics" and administration encouraging, promoting and "nourishing certain vested interests" who were not at all interested in public welfare and whose only aim it was to aggrandise their own axe even at the cost of the poor. Corruption assumed alarming proportions as the political supporters were to be kept happy and adversaries to be purchased. It did not matter even if the cost was to be very high. Bakshi's policies of pampering, appeasing and alluring his supporters and opponents culminated in the emergence of a number of "extra-constitutional centres of power". No wonder, if such centres of power took the reins of law into their own hands "to eliminate and brow beat opponents".

One of the significant aspects of Bakshi's politics was "financial blackmail." While the Sheikh had resorted to political blackmail, Bakshi resorted to financial blackmail. He made the Centre to pump into Kashmir as much public wealth as possible. The oft-repeated argument used was that money was needed to keep the Kashmiri Muslims "on the right side". It was during the Bakshi's regime that corrupt and selfish politicians and "bureaucrats" had started arguing that to make the people of Kashmir calm and quite, all "irregularities and misdeeds" had to be overlooked and condoned.

Jammu and Kashmir Plebiscite Front

If, on the one hand, corruption was becoming rampant affecting the life of the poor people and making them shake their faith in the administration, on the other, admirers,

supporters and friends of the Sheikh were rallying around Mirza Afzal Beg with a view to devise a strategy to regain the ground lost, and the Mirza became the leader, in collaboration with a band of followers, of a movement which was to regenerate a new life and a new vision in his co-religionists. The political organisation the Beg and his admirers formed in 1954 came to be known as the Jammu and Kashmir Plebiscite Front (JKPF).

Declaring plebiscite as its most cherished aim, the JKPF engineered and fomented trouble after trouble in the Valley. The JKPF movement quickly found the heart of the Kashmiris. The support it received emboldened its leaders to fan their activities throughout the Valley to advocate and preach the JKPF ideology and to explain to the people the movement's aims. The propaganda the JKPF launched did succeed in evoking tremendous response from the simple and innocent Kashmiris who couldn't understand all the intricacies. Thousands of Kashmiri Muslims enrolled themselves as the members of the JKPF.

Methods

The methods the JKLF employed to make headway among the illiterate masses and influence their simple minds or to indoctrinate them were rather dangerous. Even more dangerous was the JKLF's education making its followers boycott Assembly elections. The activities of the JKLF helped Pakistan to play its card and to fan communalism and anti-India sentiments. Pakistan took full advantage of the situation the JKLF had created. It gave liberal financial help to the JKLF's activists to engineer and foment anti-India struggle. In fact, "a major portion of the JKLF's finances came from Pakistan."

Bakshi's Involvement

It is even alleged that some of the prominent leaders and activists of the JKLF were on the Bakshi's "pay-roll". He was allegedly offering concessions to many a functionary of the JKLF just to keep his chair intact and safe. The imme-

diate political fall-out of the JKLF's machinations was the growth of anti-India elements and unprecedented corruption and political dishonesty.

Democratic National Conference

What was happening in Kashmir under the Bakshi's nose was sufficient to reflect that an insidious influence was at work to defeat the great object, for the achievement of which the Sheikh had been dismissed and arrested. Leaders, like Ghulam Mohd. Sadiq, Mir Qasim, D.P. Dhar, Girdhari Lal Dogra and others appear to have entertained a belief that an unholy and anti-India alliance between the Bakshi and some vested interests and between them and the anti-India elements was defeating and discouraging secular and pro-India force. Disturbed by certain developments during the Bakshi's regime Ghulam Mohd. Sadiq, Syed Mir Qasim, D.P. Dhar and Girdhari Lal Dogra together with their left oriented friends and other secular elements, got disillusioned with the grave situation into which the system had culminated.

Fully convinced as they were that they and other pro-India elements who preached secularism and unity and integrity of India had no place whatsoever under the Bakshi's dispensation, they resigned from the National Conference in 1957 to organise the Democratic National Conference (NDC) with strengthening and promoting of nationalist politics in the valley and countering the anti India onslaught of the JKPF's activists as its Chief objectives.

With the emergence of the DNC, Kashmir witnessed for the first time a truly pro-India opposition party based on non-sectarian and democratic issues. The DNC certainly brought Jammu and Kashmir on the threshold of a new era. An important Chapter seemed opened in the history of relations between Kashmir and the rest of India. It was thought that the goal was very near. Just at that critical moment when the DNC stalwarts were busy making a way right into the hearts of the people by spreading their new ideology, resisting and countering anti-India activities and denouncing

undesirable aspects of the Bakshi's rule, the Sheikh was released from detention in January 1958.

Sheikh Unchanged

If anything, the detention had made the Sheikh more rigid. Harboursing the dream of "independent Kashmir", he started undoing what the DNC leaders had accomplished during the one year of its existence. The first salvo that the Sheikh fired after his release was a bitter attack on the Indian govt. In an interview to the *Blitz Weekly* at Kud, the Sheikh not only denounced the centre in unequivocal terms but also eulogized Pakistan. In his speeches at Srinagar later on, he poured contempt on the Bakshi whom he accused of treachery. To be more precise, the Sheikh lashed out at the Bakshi for being "unfaithfully". The DNC leaders also came under his severe attack. DNC and its leaders were condemned as "Indian Agents" and "greater enemies of Kashmir". The insidious propaganda that he let loose, against the centre culminated in his re-arrest. He as well as some of his lieutenants were charged with "sedition and subversion" against the State. It must be highlighted that the Sheikh's severe criticism and outbursts against the DNC and its leaders were aimed at stifling the pro-India voice and presenting and projecting the JKPF as the only true and representative voice of the Kashmiris. The impression the Sheikh gave was that the Kashmiris who subscribed to the JKPF ideology were true Kashmiris, whereas leaders like Sadiq, Dhar, G.L. Dogra and others did not represent the people's aspirations and that they had joined the Indian Camp under temptation.

DNC Dissolved

The Sheikh's tactful handling, inflammatory speeches, relentless struggle for regaining the lost position and snatching the ground from under the feet of DNC leadership and Nehru's failure in appreciating the remarkable and historical role the DNC was playing made the DNC's top leadership waver and rejoin the Bakshi-Camp. Nehru, who had not learnt any lesson from the past history of the NC politics insisted that

the DNC leaders must dissolved the party and its members resion the NC to strengthen the Bakshi's hand. "Thus due to their myopic political vision, the Congress leadership lost a great opportunity of seeing pro-India political party grow in the state which could act as a safety valve by letting people ventilate their grievances and satisfy their democratic urges."

In 1963, however, the Bakshi was made to resign from the Prime Ministership of the State under the famous "Kamraj-Plan". Shrewed and a great manipulator as he was, the Bakshi succeeded in getting his own man, Shamsuddin, elected as the leader of the NC legislature party. He outmanured the Congress leaders. With the result the Bakshi drove from the back seat. But Shamsuddin could not rule for a long time. He ruled the State for just 99 days.

Shamsuddin was succeeded by Ghulam Mohd. Sadiq in February 1964. This change filled the hearts of the people with a new hope for he was known more for his liberal ideas then as a politician. A great champion of democratic rights as he was, his appointment as the Prime Minister of the State was viewed by the people as the beginning of a new era, full of hope and promise for the future. It was hoped that he would win over "volatile anti-India" elements throguh discus-sion, Sadiq, who is still hailed by all sections of the people professing different ideologies as a true democrat, progressive and secular, proved instrumental in bringing about radical changes in the State politics leading to its further unification with India. The regional politics was substituted by the main-stream politics. The N.C. was dissolved and got merged with the Indian National Congress in 1965. The State constitution was amended to have the nomenclature of the Head of the State changed from Sadr-e-Riyasat to Governor and that of the Head of the Government from Wazir-e-Azam to Chief Minister. The governor was now to be appointed by the President of India instead of being nominated by the State Legislature. In addition, the jurisdiction of the supreme court of India was extended to the State bringing its judiciary at par with the rest of the Indian States. Not only this, a

number of sections of the Indian constitution were made applicable to the State enabling its inhabitants to enjoy the fruits of Indian democracy. These historical changes, were affected to bring Kashmir into the National mainstream, facilitate the process of closer bonds between India and its Kashmir in future and to bridge the gulf widened between the two during 1947-64. The assumption of power in the state by the National party obviously strengthened the belief that the rancour, ill-will and animosity that hitherto existed between Kashmir and New Delhi would become a story of the past.

Sadiq not only tried to evolve a system to achieve permanent unity between Kashmir and the rest of India at political level but he also devised a strategy to bring about unity between the two at emotional level. Sadiq knew that the greatest danger that loomed large at the Indian Unity was from the JKPF leaders and enthusiasts.

To win the JKPF members over, Sadiq gave them a certain amount of respectability. Their wards and children were provided with handsome and cushy jobs. Though the strategy helped to some extent in "blunting the edge of the underground anti-India movement, and in neutralising the youth who were provided with jobs, it also encouraged a larger section of separatist elements to come to surface. It appears that certain anti-India elements had taken Sadiq's liberalism and well-conceived policies as his weakness. Entertaining the belief that Sadiq was weak, they organised anti-India demonstrations on a scale not witnessed before. In fact, such demonstrations became the order of the day and for the first time in the state's secessionist movement the slogan "Indian dogs go back" was raised. In other words, the situation under Sadiq instead of being improved got further aggravated rendering the important changes he had brought about in the State politics a mere sham.

Jamait-e-Islami

Sadiq breathed his last in 1971. Mir Qasim a close asso-

ciate of Sadiq, became the State Chief Minister. During his rule, the situation assumed rather dangerous proportions. It was during Mir Qasim's regime that "overt and covert support to rabid communal organisations, like the Jamait-e-Islami grew". Communal politics reigned supreme in the valley. With the result the Jamait-e-Islami could return five of its leaders to the State legislative Assembly. The success of the Jamait in the elections boosted its morale and encouraged pro-Pakistani sentiments. In fact, with the victory of five Jamait-e-Islami members, anti-India forces gained momentum and the demand for plebiscite was raised with greater vigour and frequency. High hopes of all those Indians who had been looking forward to a new era thus got frustrated.

Sheikh Brought back

During Qasim's time, the Sheikh was released on grounds best known to the powers that be in Delhi and Srinagar. What is beyond comprehension was the beginning of parleys between the central government and the Sheikh-Beg combine. Without realising the implications, Indira Gandhi, the Indian Prime Minister, thought of reconciliation. She appear dictated by a belief that there was but one way in which conciliation could be secured or anti-India sentiments could be killed and that was by handing the power over to the Sheikh. After a number of sittings, an accord was ultimately reached, known as the Indira-Sheikh Accord, 1975. The Accord with the Sheikh, under which power was handed back to him, sealed once and for all the fate of the congress party's independent status in Kashmir while the Sheikh was accused of having "sold out the people of Kashmir for the lure of the chair".

Mir Qasim was unceremoniously removed paying way for the Sheikh to do whatever he had in his mind. By accepting this Accord, "the Sheikh hadn't become a patriot overnight, nor had he forgotten the past or forgiven his detractors. But being in power he could create difficulties for the Centre and this he did unscrupulously. His first master stroke made some muslim legislators belonging to the congress defect to his side.

After assuming the coveted Chair, he reverted to his old game of singing two songs—criticising India in front of his Kashmiri audiences and expressing differently while speaking to Indian pressmen or addressing his Jammu audiences. In other words, he evolved a two-pronged strategy. To please his co-religionists in Kashmir, he would pour contempt on India and everything Indian, and after crossing the Jawahar Tunnel, he would project himself as a great champion of democracy and secularism to prove his loyalty towards the Indian nation.

Strained relations

As expected, the relations between the centre and the Sheikh got strained. That his detention from 1953 to 1973 had not at all changed his mind or that he still cherished the dream of "independent Kashmir" became clear when in 1977, the Sheikh and his National Conference contested elections on the plank of "opening the Jhelum Valley Road, withdrawal of Indian Army from Kashmir and defeating parties of India". The known "Sher-Bakra" feud was revised in a bid to placate opponents and critics of his changed political stance. A colleague of his would ask for votes with piece of Pakistani rock-salt in his hand (associated with Pakistan in the minds of Kashmiri Muslims). The modus Operandi he evolved or the methodology he adopted to win elections on his own to prove that he was the only true representative of Kashmir produced rich dividends. He won massive victories. His success at the 1977 elections and the total rout of the national parties in the valley, like the Janta Party of Jai Parkash Narain, created a dangerous situation—a situation in which he could misuse political power without any check.

Overwhelmed by an impressive victory, the Sheikh's supporters in the NC started giving the Janta Party and Congress supporters a rough time. Maulvi Farooq's followers, "Bakras" had to "flee their homes and seek shelter in safe places to escape the wrath of furious NC enthusiasts." So far as the congressmen were concerned, "the choicest epithet of vermin insects, worms crawling in the drains were reserved for them."

Islamisations

The story did not end here. If on the one hand, the NC enthusiasts were making the life of the national parties' leaders and workers difficult, on the other, the Sheikh was evolving policies to Islamise everything in Kashmir. During the second phase of the Sheikh's rule, obscurantist forces were encouraged and patronised. The administration was Islamised as far as possible. "Friday prayers were allowed to be offered in offices." Cinema shows on Friday were "cancelled" during the time of Namaz. Not only this, well-thoughtout and calculated efforts were made to undermine the Indian authority and foment ill-will between Kashmir and the rest of India. Who in India doesn't know the rough treatment meted out to the income tax officials who visited Kashmir to enquire into cases of tax evasion by some big business houses. It may be recalled that during their stay in Kashmir the income tax officials when under physical assault by "violent mobs organised by the NC" cadres had been "denied police assistance".

The Jamait-e-Islami schools were allowed to function. This was despite the fact that the Sheikh had promised to take Islamia Schools over. Instead, the Sheikh's dispensation took no cognizance of the massive financial support to the Jamait-e-Islami and its front organisations, including the Jamait-e-Ahl-E-Hadia from Pakistan and Saudi Arabia which had become the order of the day. The situation worsened when in 1980, the Jamait-e-Islami played host to a delegation from the Medina University. The members of the delegation were lavishly entertained by the Sheikh himself. The warm welcome the delegation was given and the tremendous response it evoked in the circles those matter in the process of Islamisation encouraged Prof. Abdul Samad, a prominent member of the delegation, to go to the extent of saying at an open meeting at Hotel Lala Rukh, Srinagar, that "for an Islamic revolution we have to prepare the people individually and collectively. To achieve it we have to give sacrifices." The same year, Maulana Abdullah of the Jamait-e-Islami, POK, paid a visit to Kashmir. He in open and public proclaimed

that "Kashmiris were not a party to the Shimla Agreement". It is alleged that Maulana Abdullah's visit to Kashmir was aimed at apprising his counterpart of the valley of General Zia's (General Zia ul-Haq was the President of Pakistan) Kashmir Plan, Operation Topac. Maulana Abdullah's visit, however, alarmed the Central Government. It took prompt action and Maulana Abdullah was ordered to leave Kashmir "within twenty four hours".

Yet another step that the Sheikh took to completely Islamise Kashmir was a special SRO issued to "change the names of hundred of Kashmir villages so as to obliterate traces of old history and culture."

Still another alarming and unnerving aspect of the Sheikh's second dispensation was sweeping changes in the administration at higher level. The IAS officials from outside the State were shifted to insignificant positions, barring a few who toed the Sheikh's line. Most of the higher and more lucrative appointments in the government, in the revenue administration, in the police department and in the judicial and political services were made the sole monopoly of those Kashmiri Muslims who pinned their full faith in the Sheikh and those who acted as co-exploiters with him. Such changes in the administration and political structure were enough to generate forces inimical to India and its sovereignty. Thus the gulf between Kashmir and India instead of being bridged was further widened.

The Sheikh spent his last years in power. The only contribution that he made was "make India a suspect in the eyes of Kashmiri Muslims". That, in fact, was the reason behind denouncing all Kashmiri Pandits as IB Agents in his autobiography (*Aatish-e-Chinar*) and castigating and condemning Indian secularism and congress leaders. It is interesting to note that *Aatis-e-Chinar* has been awarded the Sahitya Academy Award.

Farooq Imposed

In September 1982, Sheikh Abdullah died and Dr. Farooq Abdullah imposed on the state as the Chief Minister as per the Sheikh's will and with the blessing of none other than Mrs. Indira Gandhi. Since 1947, Kashmir has continued to simmer : some times boiling over, at others enjoying comparative peace, especially under Bakshi Ghulam Mohd. and G M. Sadiq despite the fact that the anti-India activities were going on. With their exist, condition began to deteriorate, more so under the family rule of the Sheikh's—first the son, Dr. Farooq Abdullah, then the son-in-law, G.M. Shah and then again the son, Farooq Abdullah. Both gross mis-rule and family feuds contributed in no small degree to the frustration of the people and making the confusion worse confounded.

It needs to be emphasized that Farooq Abdullah had his political education and training in U.K. where he had developed contacts with the Jammu and Kashmir Liberation Front's activists. When the JKLF supreme, Amanullah Khan fled Pakistan with a few of his friends to evade arrest and reached London in 1971, Farooq Abdullah's bonds with the secessionist outfit became more and more stronger. It is on record that when in 1973, Farooq Abdullah visited Pakistan he had made it a point to go to POK. It was in POK that he had taken an oath to "liberate Kashmir" in a function the JKLF had organised in his honour. "When the Sheikh was accorded a reception in Kashmir after his return to power (in 1975), Farooq too joined the procession alongwith a number of his JKLF friends whom he had brought all the way from England" and raised a new slogan "Chyon Desh, Myon Desh—Kashur Desh, Kashur Desh" (Kashmir is your country, and mine).

The first thing that Farooq Abdullah did on assuming office was the declaration in open and public that "he will never compromise the dignity and honour of Kashmiris, even if it means fighting the mighty India". Three months were

enough to harden his attitude towards India or to adopt anti-Centre and anti-Congress posture. That he was assuming threatening posture became evident when at the "Kashmir University functions", he exhorted students to preserve "Kashmiriyat and Islamic identity".

More than that, Farooq Abdullah accused India of fomenting communal trouble and asked "whether the Kashmiri Mussalman is safe in India". Like his father, he would project himself as an Indian patriot before Central political leaders and mediemen attacking Mrs. Indira Gandhi and her Congress. To resist the so-called onslaughts of the Central Government against the "Kashmiriat" Farooq Abdullah befriended Maulvi Farooq, an arch rival of the Abdullah family, and raised the slogan of "Muslim brotherhood". Not only this, he set up a youth wing of the National Conference and indoctrinated its members to work unitedly for the "battle of freedom".

The situation assumed alarming proportions when the 1983 elections to the State Assembly drew nearer. Shaky and inconstant as he was, Farooq Abdullah started fulminating against India and the Union Government. Addressing election rallies he would say : "We are fighting the Congress. Its defeat will mean defeat of the Central power that wants to subjugate the Kashmiris". The insidious propaganda that Farooq Abdullah let loose to win the Assembly elections bore rich fruit for the National Conference. Farooq Abdullah and his party won from most of the Muslim-dominated constituencies playing anti-India and anti-Hindu cards. The Congress, on the contrary, won from most of the Hindu-dominated constituencies in the Jammu region. It won elections in the Jammu region playing pro-India and anti-Muslim cards.

It was during Farooq Abdullah's second tenure between 1983 and 1984 that a one day crickent match between India and West Indies was played at Srinagar. When the match was in progress, the Indian players were Jeered at and greeted with slogans : "Indian dogs go back". The anti-India slogans

were raised by the Kashmiri youth with Pakistani Flags in their hands. All this happened right under the nose of Farooq Abdullah who was gracing the occasion by witnessing the anti-India drama. The pandemonium that broke out did not at all bother Farooq Abdullah. The matter came to a head when he himself tried to justify the anti-India act performed by the Kashmiri youth. The demonstration against the Indian players was perhaps the mechanism of those who wanted to make the foreign team believe that Kashmiris were not with India. What happened during the match culminated in the cancellation of such international events in Kashmir in the future.

Fully convinced of the fact that Farooq Abdullah was a liability and not an asset and disgusted with his cavalier attitude and frivolous manner, Mrs. Indira Gandhi manipulated his ouster by engineering defections on an unprecedented scale. G.M. Shah, Farooq Abdullah's brother-in-law, was won over. Supported by the Congress, G.M. Shah formed a new government in July 1984.

Chaos

G.M. Shah's appointment as the State Chief Minister proved costly for Kashmir in particular and for India in general. During his short rule, the State which had already witnessed political instability and blackmail, got slumped into utter chaos, anarchy, confusion and uncertainty. Subversion and bomb became the cult of the secessionists. Things reached a situation where curfew had to be imposed and reimposed for long hours, nay for days together, to restore normalcy. The life under Shah came to a standstill as the normal activities stood completely paralysed. Some interpreted the subversive activities as the handiwork of the JKLF enthusiasts allegedly instigated and inspired by Farooq Abdullah to settle score with his brother-in-law, G.M. Shah. The situation in which Shah placed the State was highly explosive and not surprisingly, his Government was dubbed by those feeling disgusted and annoyed as the "curfew government."

1986 Riots

With Shah also came an extreme form of communalism and religious fanaticism giving altogether a new orientation to the Kashmir politics. The far reaching effects of the new developments and the events connected with them rendered Shah weak and ineffective. The government got reduced to nullity. With the result it failed in restraining fundamentalists who had launched a tirade against the miniscule minority of Kashmiri Pandits with frightening them as their chief plank. The situation reached dangerous proportions when in 1986 riots rocked Kashmir on an unprecedented scale. Anantnag suffered the worst type of plunder, arson and desecration of temples. Everywhere the targets were the Pandits and their temples. In the absence of any check on the activities of the fanatics, the life of the microscopic minority became a veritable hell on the earth. The riots overawed every right-thinking Indian and caused alarm. After taking stock of the volatile situation created by the divisive and communal forces under the regime they themselves had imposed, Rajiv Gandhi and his lieutenants decided to withdraw their party's support to the Shah's ministry. Order could be restored only after the imposition of the Governor rule and strict enforcement of law of the land.

Rajiv-Farooq Accord

At a time when Jagmohan, the State Governor, was busy reorganising the administration and setting things right to provide a clean and efficient dispensation and restore public confidence which hitherto stood shattered, Farooq Abdullah was leaving no stone unturned to befriend Rajiv to recapture power. "Corrupt politicians and big businessmen" also advocated restoration of what they called "popular rule" believing that under Jagmohan they would not be able to "get their share of loot". The Congress leaders who had lost their say under Jagmohan and who under him were feeling restless also persuaded Rajiv to put the Governor rule to an end. Their machinations and Farooq's efforts made Rajiv put

Farooq back in the Chief Minister's chair.

The lust for power and office culminated into what is politically known as Rajiv-Farooq Accord of 1987. As expected, the Accord played havoc in Kashmir as it was denounced as unholy, unjust and unpolitic. It was not based on principle. The motives behind the Accord were, undoubtedly, ulterior. The Congress joined hands with Farooq whom it had dethroned and dubbed as anti-national not long ago and whose activities it regarded as prejudicial for the unity and integrity of India. Farooq, on the other hand, mended his fences with the Congress not because he loved it but because he wanted to destroy whatever little base it still had in the Valley and to recapture power. In fact, both Rajiv and Farooq were afraid of each other and both in their heart of hearts wanted to eliminate each other politically. What they lost sight of in the process were the ugly and rather dangerous consequences of their action in the Valley.

NC-Congress lost

In spite of their small size, their muddled thinking and other weaknesses the part played by certain Congress leaders in Kashmir politics was far from unimportant. But their identification with the NC in 1987 in the Valley had two results. First, it made them indolent and intellectually sterile. If their political duty did not lie beyond endorsing the NC policy, any further exertion was unnecessary. By becoming uncritical supporters of the NC they lost their former flexibility of manoeuvre and even less agreeable to the masses. For they had no wares of their own to put on the market, they paid the price of unpopularity and total political extinction as far as their existence in the Valley was concerned. Their own supporters deserted them and held aloof from the Congress weighing other options.

The prophecy of many a political pandit that the Accord would demolish the NC citadel in the Valley proved true. In the Assembly election of the same year, the NC had to face a rough weather. Fully convinced that his party would suffer

unprecedented reverses in the Valley, Farooq resorted to all possible mal-practices throwing all norms and decency to the wind, the worst being the gross misuse of police and administrative machinery to manipulate election results in his favour.

Muslim United Front

Some activists of the NC who earlier had "burnt the Congress Office" in Srinagar at the "instance" of their leaders and indulged in other subversive activities, felt cheated, humbled and humiliated by the Accord. Believing that the Accord was a blatant bluff and a grievous injury and that Farooq had let Kashmir down, young activists of the NC and some other outfits organised themselves into what was known as the Muslim United Front (MUF). The new alliance was a combination of the Jamait-i-Islami, the People's Party, the Itihad-i-Musalman, the Awami Action Committee, the Independent NC of G.M. Shah and some youth and student organisations who did not believe in India unity and sovereignty. The rise of the MUF evoked tremendous response. It was hoped that the MUF would win not less than 15 seats in the Assembly election. But Farooq who was determined to capture power at whatever cost got the MUF defeated. Its workers were brutally beaten up, insulted and humiliated.

Birth of terrorism

The manipulated victory and humiliation inflicted upon the opponents, particularly those belonging to the MUF, changed the course of the history of secessionism in Kashmir. If anything, the 1987 election brought militancy, terrorism and defiance of the State authority and a virtual parallel government whose writ was to reign supreme in the days to come.

The first to react was a group of young boys of the Amirakadal constituency. Hitherto this very group acted as a "martial brigade" of none other than the NC. This was the group which got particularly infuriated and took pledge to

avenge their humiliation". One Aijaz Bar declared right in front of the counting hall-hall from where he had been forcibly kicked out "by the police and the NC candidate". that" he and his friends would shoot Farooq and other NC leaders as well as top police and civil officers and other prominent persons". However, Aijaz Dar was killed in a police "encounter" and with his death a new era of terrorism and militancy commenced with the cult of bomb and gun taking a particularly serious turn.

Terrorism

Fully convinced that he had lost touch with the masses, that he had lost whatever popularity he hitherto enjoyed among them and that the militants would not allow him a free hand, Farooq devised a strategy to appease, reconcile and befriend his arch opponents to regain the group lost. The first salvo that he fired was the release of 23 "top militants", including some self-styled "Area Commanders" of today allegedly with the concurrence of Rajiv Gandhi on the plea that the action would give them a chance to shun violence and join the mainstream politics. This amnesty, however, failed to produce the desired results. Terrorism showed no sign of abatement in Kashmir, being quite unmoved by the Farooq's boon-release of militants. The well organised MUF, which now had branches throughout the Valley and even beyond it, concentrated on bomb blasts and sniping at police officials.

Bomb blasts and sniping at police officials was followed by a new strategy which included attacks on buses, tourist coaches and Central Government offices. The militants evolved this strategy to frighten pro-India elements and disseminate the idea that India and everything Indian would no longer be tolerated in Kashmir.

Emboldened by the success of their strategy, the militants went to the extent of celebrating on August 14, 1989, Pakistan's Independence Day with great pomp and show right in the heart of the Srinagar city and under the nose of the State police with the CRPF personnels watching the anti-India

drama as silent-spectators in the absence of any orders to crush the pro-Pak elements. Worse happened when on August 15 India's Independence Day celebrations were boycotted, the National Flag made a bonfire of at a number of places and blackout observed throughout the Valley in the evening.

The story of terrorism did not end here. It broadened its base of operation engulfing school buildings, business concerns and godowns. A number of school buildings and godowns were burnt and ransacked. Anyone reporting such incident to the police got the stock reply : "Take it easy and forget about it". The rot became so deep that even some of the close relations of NC ministers started indulging in such terrorist activities. This became evident when "a Kalashnikov gun, a few handgrenades and time bombs were recovered from the residence of the Law Minister's son-in-law, a junior engineer. The police took the younger brother of the junior engineer into custody in connection this case but was released on the "insistence" of Farooq.

The next to suffer at the hands of the militants were the liquor dealers and media men. Bars and liquor shops were looted and bombed. Clubs and tourist hotels, including the Amar Singh club, the Srinagar Club and the Golf Club of which Farooq himself was the President, the Broadway Hotel, etc. were ordered to close their bars. Liquor traders were attacked, their premises ransacked and looted forcing them to close down their business.

The control of the militants over the Valley became so tight and complete that it overawed the media men, particularly those belonging to Kashmir. They forced the media men report the terrorist activities more prominently. The local dailies which obliged the terrorists and pro-Pak elements by not publishing anything that went against them also included the *Quami Awaz*, an official organ of the State Congress.

Equally intriguing was the manner in which pistols and other such arms issued to the NC leaders for self-protection found their way to the terrorists. Yet another unprecedented

cult that raised its ugly head in 1989 was the "Civil Curfew" to be imposed by the militants. That Farooq had completely abdicated his authority was evident from the prompt closure of shops and concerns owed by the Government whenever the terrorists gave a strike call or clamped "Civil Curfew".

The secessionists' activities and Farooq's indifferent attitude coupled with the release of 23 "top militants" obviously demoralised the police officials" some of whom were asked telephonically by the terrorists to stay away and not to burn their fingers unnecessarily". The message was thus loud and clear. It did not surprise anyone when "police and civil administration officers" started giving "shelter to terrorists". "Some police officers were even seen saluting them. Some known terrorists were seen walking down the streets of Srinagar and exchanging hello with policemen on duty".

Rubiya Episode

With Rubiya's kidnapping commenced what may be termed as the last phase of the separatist movement in Kashmir. The kidnapping and the subsequent release of Dr. Rubiya, Union Home Minister's daughter, in exchange for five top-ranking terrorists regardless of the impact it would have on the ongoing upsurge in Kashmir for 'Azadi' proved a last nail in the coffin of the NC-Congress(I) coalition Government besides sending shock-waves throughout the length and breadth of the country. In addition, the release of the militants sent wrong signals to the Indian adversaries as the entire drama was enacted taking into account personal rather than national interests.

With their spirits soaring higher than ever before, subversives, secessionists and their sympathisers filled the streets in their thousands to celebrate what the Kashmiris termed as their unprecedented victory over India; singing and dancing Bhangras wildly. The anti-Indian and Pro-Pakistan slogans, "Azadi, Azadi", "Hindustan, Murdabad" and "Pakistan, Zindabad" rented the air. The release of the militants and what the Kashmiris, young and old, men and women, teachers

and students and who not, did to celebrate the occasion certainly created an impression that Pakistan had won the battle against India with the help of Kashmiris themselves or the Kashmir had become an integral part of Pakistan. The dispensation of Farooq became so much paralysed, nay insensitive, that it did nothing to check the anti-India drama. Even curfew was not imposed. In fact, the entire administration seemed cooperating with the militants and pro-Pakistani elements in their frightening display of strength and victory.

Armed Training

Farooq was not only responsible for allowing the situation to deteriorate, but he was also responsible for the creation of a situation conducive for armed training of the Kashmiri youths in Pakistan. It may be recalled that it was in 1984-85 when Farooq was ruling the State that the first batch of Kashmiri youths received armed training in Pakistan. This batch also included a number of known "NC activists who were sent to Pakistan with the blessings of Important NC leaders".

Following the lead given by the NC leaders, the Jamait-i-Islami also started sending its adherents to Pakistan for armed training with a view to step-up subversive activities against India and pro-India elements living in Kashmir. Training camps were even set-up in the outskirts of Srinagar as well as rural and border areas. The intelligence agencies fully aware of such activities sent report after report to the Union Government for immediate necessary action. But Rajiv Gandhi did not take cognizance of the alarming reports on the plea that the law and order was a state subject. It was indeed intriguing and amusing to interpret setting-up of training camps around Srinagar and armed training of the Kashmiri youth in Pakistan as a law and order problem. Insensitive, irresponsible and inconstant as he was, Farooq informed the Central Government that the reports about the training camps around Srinagar and border areas were baseless, frivo-

lous and concocted. His denial was all the more serious because he also held the Home portfolio.

Thus, while the administration kept sleeping and displaying callousness, pro-Pakistani elements made hay and freely trained young Kashmiris in the use of most sophisticated and deadly weapons. The militants succeeded while the Government completely failed. Under those favourable circumstances, the cult of bomb and Kalashnikov got a new dimension with the extremists getting more and more defiant with each passing day, till the situation exploded in December 1989. A number of militant outfits came into being, of course, varying in hues but completely united in their determination to "liberate" Kashmir from India and following a well-planned strategy of creating terror and anarchy to paralyse the government to spread the gospel that India had no say whatsoever in Kashmir. The new outfits that emerged and held and are still holding Kashmir to ransom include the Hizbi Islami, the *Dukhtaran-i-Kashmir*, the Hizbul Mujahideen, the Allah tigers, the Al Khomeini, the Operation Balakot, etc. The fascination the slogan of the militant outfits gave had its impact on the bureaucracy, nay on all the Government employees belonging to the Valley of Kashmir. With the entry into Kashmir's separatist movement of the employees right from Additional Chief Secretary down to the orderlies the divide between India and Kashmir appears to be complete. When the administrative machinery, whose duty it is to maintain law and order and render all possible help in preserving the unity and integrity of the country, is indulging in anti-India activities and approaching the "Citizens of the World" condemning the atrocities alleged to have been committed by the administration of which they are the most important part, when it seems to have openly joined the secessionists in supporting their demand of 'Azadi' and when it is not helping the Government in any way to control the volatile situation, one can only express surprise at how the Governor and his advisors are meeting the challenge. How are they working in such a critical situation, only they know?

Operation Topac

It needs to be emphasized that the Kashmiri militant outfits are working as per a plan worked out by General Zia-ul-Haq, the former Pakistan President. The Plan is styled, "Operation Topac". However, it does not mean that before Zia no attempt had been made to foment trouble in Kashmir. In fact, it was in the time of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto whom general Zia succeeded after a successful coup that a concrete step towards that direction had been taken. The formation of the JKLF was part of the subversive plan hatched during Bhutto's regime. It had been set-up primarily to scare the pro-India elements. The modus operandi prescribed for the Anti-India out fit was "killing and kidnapping" of the Pro-India elements.

However, it was General Zia who very cleverly evolved a plan of "subtrefuse, subversion and terrorism in Punjab and Kashmir "providing claws to militancy." General Zia's Kashmir Plan, called "Operation Topac", was prepared very carefully and painstakingly with the active assistance of ISI (Pakistani intelligence agency). The Plan was to be enforced not at once but in three phases. General Zia was of the firm opinion that" it would take a lot of time for Kashmiri Muslims to rise in armed revolt against India as they have no martial tradition, but they can through their cunning subvert Indian polity in Kashmir. Attention should be concentrated on winning over Muslim bureaucracy and police force and dry up all intelligence sources. Once it is done, rest can be left to Pak Forces."

The happenings in Kashmir during the last one year or so clearly reflect how meticulously the "Operation Topac" was prepared and how systematically it has been implemented in Kashmir. Some of the Chief features of the "Operation Topac" whose influence under Kashmir is are :

- (a) spread fear and terror;
- (b) spread half-truths and falsehoods;

- (c) demoralise and humble political adversaries;
- (d) win active support and sympathy of Muslim police and bureaucracy in the name of Islam and Jihad;
- (e) eliminate all opposition and dissent by means of threats, bomb blasts or shoot-outs or snipings;
- (f) resort to selective killings of non-Muslims and frighten them away verbally or through written warnings;
- (g) resort to arson, loot, plunder and destruction of Wine shops, bars, video parlours, beauty parlours, cinema houses etc. as these are un-Islamic or against the holy covenant;
- (h) enforce strict adherence to Islamic rules of conduct; for instance, *purdah* in case of women;
- (i) Kill Indian intelligence personnels, particularly non-muslims;
- (j) burn down government and private educational institutions run by non-muslims and promote Jamait Schools;
- (k) disallow any political activity except that which is permitted by militant organisations;
- (l) control all local mosques and mullahs;
- (m) ambush and attack security forces;
- (n) Kidnap VIPS and their relations and
- (o) assassinate political enemies and deserters.

Pakistan Won

The following few glaring examples will clearly prove how methodically and carefully general Zia's "Operation Topac" has been enforced in the Valley of Kashmir bringing all activities, political, administrative and otherwise to a standstill

causing deep concern to the Indian authorities and pleasing their Pakistani counter parts :

- (a) innumerable demonstrations the militants organised and are still organising to incite the Kashmiri Muslims to acts of treason and violence;
- (b) the anti-India and Pro-Pakistan slogans being blared during demonstrations;
- (c) observance of black days and nights on such festive occasions as the Independence Day and the Republic Day;
- (d) the secessionists attempted move to declare Kashmir as the Islamic Republic of Kashmir on January 26, 1990;
- (e) the reign of terror the militants have let loose and the parallel government that they are running;
- (f) innumerable attacks by the militants on the paramilitary forces and the use of most sophisticated and deadly weapons, like Rocket Launchers;
- (g) Open defiance of the State authority and kidnappings and brutal killings of a large number of peace-loving, nationalist and law-abiding citizens;
- (h) the closure of wine shops, clubs, tourist hotels, cinema houses, beauty parlours, industrial establishments, banks, post-offices and what not;
- (i) atrocities committed by the fundamentalists and pro-Pakistani elements on the Muslims and non-muslims who did not see eye to eye with the militants;
- (j) the near total exodus of the minority Community in search of safe abodes;
- (k) the pushing back of the needles of the Indian watches by half an hour to enforce Pakistan Standard time in

Kashmir;

- (l) the participation of 1.37 lac Kashmiri employees, right from the additional Chief Secretary to the Government down to the orderlies and
- (m) the submission of innumerable memoranda to the UNO and "the people of world" against the atrocities alleged to have been committed by the Indian paramilitary forces.

The points referred to above clearly demonstrate that the "Operation Topac" has brought about unprecedented havoc in the Valley and has won tremendous local support against India. At the same time it would not be an exaggeration to say that the two wars of 1965 and 1971 could not achieve for Pakistan what Indira Gandhi did in 1975 and her son, Rajiv Gandhi, did in 1987. Indira Gandhi's efforts towards reconciliation proved ill-fated. Her Accord with Sheikh Mohd. Abdullah, under which political power was handed back to him after a gap of 29 years, sealed the fate of the Congress Party's independent status in Kashmir for all the times to come; While the Sheikh was accused by the Kashmiris of having "sold out the people of Kashmir for the lure of the Chair."

But the maximum damage was done by the highly rigged 1987 Assembly elections and the reinstallation of Farooq Abdullah as the State Chief Minister. To the Kashmiris Farooq Abdullah appeared as a "Stooge" of the congress and the Centre. From the country's standpoint, no consideration whatsoever seemed to have been given to his "antecedents: his shallow roots (or none at all) in Kashmiri Politics, having spent most of his early life in the U.K; his sudden emergence as Chief Minister on the Sheikh's death with a dynastic claim; his anti-India postures while living in England, and his reportedly being as late as 1973, in the secessionist camp". And as Chief Minister, invariably he happened to be "fiddling" abroad like nero while Rome burnt. People felt isolated, and their alienation was allowed to grow deeper and deeper and

wider and wider, which helped a handful of secessionists to become more bolder and bolder with each passing day in their anti-India activities for which they went scot-free: bomb blasts, the hoisting of the Pakistan flag in Srinagar on Independence Day in 1989, public mourning on the death anniversary of General Zia, and the Kidnapping of the Union Home Minister's daughter, Dr. Rubia Sayeed. And the result, the present turmoil.

Responsibility

Who is then the perpetrator of the Kashmir Curse? whose actions complicated the already rather complex Kashmir problem and hampered the process of normalisation? The perpetrator of the Kashmir curse was certainly J.L. Nehru. Not once, but many aspects of his Kashmir policy were responsible for generating forces inimical to India and inculcating in the minds of the Kashmiris a sense that they are a race apart. And if they have started living in water-tight compartments having nothing to do with the rest of the Indians, it is natural and it should not surprise any person.

Nehru can legitimately be accused of inept handling of the Kashmir question on several grounds: firstly, the way he tackled the question of the State's accession to the Indian Union on October 26, 1947; secondly, the insensitiveness that he displayed towards the advice tendered to him by certain well-meaning persons such as Sardar Patel, Shyama Prasad Mookarji and others; thirdly, the manner in which he dismissed Hari Singh and Mehr Chand Mahajan and accepted whatever Sheikh Abdullah said forgetting the June 3, 1947, Mountbatten Plan which empowered the rulers alone to join or not to join any of the two Dominions, India and Pakistan; fourthly, the latitude he allowed to a foreigner, Lord Mountbatten to commit as dangerous an assurance as plebiscite in Kashmir to Mohd. Ali Jinnah who did not ask for it and that too without the consent of the Union Council of Ministers, including Nehru himself; fifthly, the *modus operandi* he evolved to confer a very special status on Kashmir forgetting

the adverse impact such special status would have on other Indian States; sixthly, the unjust, invidious and humiliating distinctions that he made between the Kashmiris and other Indians including Jammuities and Ladakhis, completely ignoring the vital fact that the undue concessions to one would embolden others to press for the same; seventhly, for the wide, arbitrary and unreasonable latitude he gave to Shekh Abdullah not only to decide the fate of the Kashmiris but also of Jammuities and Ladakhis whose views on the State's relations with the Centre were well known; eighthly, for the general distrust of Jammuities and Ladakhis that ran through the whole course of his Kashmir Policy; ninthly, the way he took India's internal matter to the United Nations enabling the western world to play their nefarious games in India and lastly, the manner in which he enforced ceasefire in the night of December 31, 1948, that too at a time when India's territory was under Pakistan's control and when Indian forces had brought the Pak forces to their knees and were about to inflict a crushing defeat on Pakistan.

All the above-referred to significant and most relevant points clearly reflect political follies Nehru committed in Kashmir. It is essential to note that the Kashmir policy as evolved by Nehru was not at all responsible for making Jammu and Kashmir accede to the Indian Union as has been insinuated by O. N. Dhar and a few other writers of his ilk (Kashmir: Illusion and reality, Hindustan Times, October, 2 1990). Only Dhar can take the liberty to say: "The view that if Sardar Patel had been allowed to handle Kashmir, things could have been different, is highly superficial".

Dhar appears to have outrightly rejected vital aspects of the Kashmir policy while analysing the present embroglio and passing judgements. Emotions seem to have dominated Dhar's writing. Had he gone into all the events before and after the accession, he would not have opined. It was Nehru's vision and his commitment to the basic ideals of India that attracted Kashmir despite its overwhelming muslim majority-to India and if this country (India) succeeds in retaining it as

a part and parcel of the Republic, it will be because of the secular-democratic legacy left by him.

Only Dhar and writers of his brand can refuse to analyse the basic factors leading to the ongoing insurgency in the Valley and derive conclusions based on analysis of certain imaginary and superficial aspects. One may ignore the above referred to points, but one certainly cannot afford to overlook many an observation Nehru himself made on his own doings and those of Sheikh Mohd. Abdullah. An Analysis of the two of his many observations would be enough to conclude how wrong he was in his assessment about the Sheikh and in taking the Kashmir issue to the United Nations. The observations are:

1. "The Sheikh had indulged in communal activities throughout the period he had acted as the National Conference leader. It was the Pakistani aggression which had mellowed him little for a short time, because the tribals had committed gruesome atrocities on the Muslim population in the Valley. But as soon as he became the Prime Minister, he came out in his true colours **ONCE AGAIN**, and started anti-Hindu activities . . . his entire outlook and behaviour was based on the fact that the Kashmir Valley had Muslim Majority" and
2. "The Kashmir issue has been raised to an international level by OUR reference to the Security Council of the UN and most of the great powers are intensely interested in what happens in Kashmir. . . .Kashmir issue has given us a great deal of **TROUBLE**. . . The attitude of the great powers has been astonishing, some of them have shown active partisanship for Pakistan".

If the acts of Nehru or his Kashmir policy came as a surprise, the varied activities of his daughter, Indira Gandhi, and his grandson, Rajiv Gandhi, were no less so. G.M. Sadiq, D.P. Dhar, Syed Mir Kasim and Girdhari Lal Dogra had worked hard to undo the wrongs the NC had committed

between October 1947 and 1965. The dissolution of the NC, a Kashmir-based regional party, and its substitution by the Indian National Congress, a national party, with its base in Jammn, Kashmir and Ladakh, was the handiwork of G M. Sadiq and his associates. The Congress rule notwithstanding its weaknesses and shortcomings had promised a new chapter of harmonious relations between Kashmir and India. True that certain anti-India elements were still there in Kashmir but it is equally true that the situation as it existed during that period was not that alarming. And just at that time when the Congress had started broadening its mass base in Kashmir, Indira Gandhi suddenly found in Sheikh Mohd. Abdullah a person who could stem the rot and bring about reconciliation between Kashmir and India. Her sudden decision to give political power back to Sheikh Abdullah in 1975 surprised everyone. The people were taken aback all the more because the antecedents of Sheikh Abdullah were already too well-known-antecedents which not only cost him Prime Minister's chair but also earned him jail not for one year or two years but for twenty two years ostensibly on the charge or activities considered fatal for the legitimate interests of Indian unity and integrity.

What could have been a greater political blunder than that she should bring down her own party's government and kill the party itself in the Valley and sow seeds for the revival of the NC to its pristine glory—a party which by any standard was communal and in no way committed to safeguarding and promoting democratic values and secularism and providing due share to Jammu and Ladakh in the State's political, administrative and economic structure. History has yet to find out a leader who had killed his/her own party to give absolute power to someone who could not be taken for granted, particularly when that someone had been dubbed as anti-national.

Like Nehru, Indira Gandhi too had to eat her words and change attitude completely. She took less than two years to realise the gravity of the situation for which she herself was

squarely responsible and reconsider her opinion about Sheikh Mohd. Abdullah. The extent of the animosity, rancour and ill-will between the two surfaced when both the parties clashed during the first elections to the Assembly after the sheikh had been restored to the high office of Chief Minister, to capture power. Indira Gandhi and her party won elections in Jammu playing the Hindu and Pro-India cards, whereas Sheikh Abdullah inflicted a crushing and everlasting defeat on her party in the valley playing the Muslim and anti-centre cards. This obviously widened the gulf between Kashmir and India.

Rajiv Gandhi too did not lag behind. He refused to learn any lesson from the past mistakes committed by Nehru and Indira Gandhi. He made no attempt at undoing the wrongs whose fruits Nehru and Indira Gandhi and the nation as a whole had already tasted. Instead, he went a step further and be friended Farooq Abdullah not once but a number of times forgetting his past role which like his father, Sheikh Abdullah, had cost him the Chief Minister's post.

The scale J. L. Nehru, Indira Gandhi and Rajiv Gandhi used to enthrone or dethrone Sheikh Mohd. Abdullah and Farooq Abdullah was mysterious indeed. Indira Gandhi would one day find in Sheikh Mohd. Abdullah a nationalist of nationalists and a patriot of patriots, but after sometime she would discover in him India's formidable adversary. Rajiv Gandhi also used the same mysterious scale to measure Farooq's nationalism or otherwise. Such machinations were obviously destined to meet the fate the two Indian Prime Ministers met. And it was no wonder that the Kashmir problem became complex with each passing day with chances of retrieval becoming dim and remote.

Then the Utter failure of Article 370-Article 370 had been incorporated in the Indian Constitution in the hope that it would bring the Kashmiri Muslims in the National mainstream-must have disillusioned and disappointed the framers of the Article. Those who propounded this irrational theory must be feeling Sad as any broken-hearted man does and must

be singing in the strain of the Swan. If anything, the theory had kept the Kashmiris away from the mainstream politics and the rest of the Indians. The slogans, "Indian dogs, go back," "Hindustan Murdabad", and "Pakistan, Zindabad" are the results. The propounders of the theory must be now waiting for a miracle to happen to stem the rot and bridge the so wide a gulf-a task which more than 70,000 crores of rupees have failed to accomplish.

Dr. Karan Singh's observations that "... the situation deteriorated rapidly after the National Front Government assumed office late last year", that "before that, whatever the weaknesses and shortcomings of the coalition government headed by Dr. Farooq Abdullah and there were many, it at least provided a framework for political and economic activity, and the law and order situation also was generally under control" and that "the reappointment of Mr. Jagmohan as Governor gave Dr. Abdullah the occasion to quietly withdraw from the scene, thus nullifying the only major pro-Indian political party in the Valley, the National Conference" appear highly superficial. Of course, Farooq Abdullah's coalition government provided a framework forth so called political and economic activity, and the so-called law and order situation also was generally under Control. All this was because the so-called pro-India party was not taking any cognizance of bomb-blasts, shoot outs, burning of the Indian Tricolour, celebration of Pakistan's Independence Day, boycott of the Indian Independence Day, the hoisting of the Pakistani flag and so on. It must be borne in mind that Jagmohan was appointed at a time when the situation had gone out of control and the militants had planned to declare Kashmir an Islamic Republic of Kashmir on January 26, 1990, the Indian Republic day.

Admitted that Pakistan's blatant interference in Kashmir affairs is one of the potent causes responsible for the "Freedom struggle" in Kashmir. Again admitted, that Pakistan had embarrassed and is still embarrassing India in the United Nations and at other international forums. What then, who

is responsible ? Certainly, Jawaharlal Nehru, Lal Bahadur Shastri and Indira Gandhi. In 1947-48, India got an opportunity not only to teach Pakistan a good lesson, but also to solve the Kashmir problem once and for all. But Jawaharlal Nehru missed it. Rather his adamancy allowed Pakistan to grab India's substantial territory, now called, Azad Kashmir. During the second Indo-Pak War of 1965, Pakistan was at the receiving end. But the Indian Army and Air Force was restrained from inflicting a crushing defeat which certainly would have broken the Pakistan's backbone. In 1971, India was in an advantageous position. The 1971 war which India fought with Pakistan is one of the 10 most decisive wars the world has ever fought. That India was in a commanding position in 1971 was evident from the unconditional surrender of the Pakistani Army Commanders and soldiers whose number was as large as 96,000. India was in a position to re-occupy Pakistan-Occupied-Kashmir and to solve the Kashmir tangle. But what did Indira Gandhi do ? She only converted the Indian Victory into an utter defeat making Pakistan to scot-free. What could be more unfortunate for India than that Pakistan should refuse to accept the Shimla Agreement of 1972 wherein lies nothing but India's defeat.

It needs to be emphasized that Pakistan's intervention in Kashmir and its affairs is not something which should surprise Indians. Pakistan has got to do so as Kashmir is a card the Pakistani rulers play to retain power and to divert people's attention from internal problems, like poverty, unemployment, lawlessness, corruption and such other curses. Pakistan should be accepted as one of the chief factors in the situation and as such should be recognised as an India's foe with which Indian leadership has to deal and with whose leaders India must reckon and reckon effectively. So far, the Central leadership has failed the Indians by not checking Pakistani's insidious propaganda on Kashmir at several international forums.

On the basis of what has been discussed it can be authoritatively said that Jawaharlal Nehru gave birth to the

Kashmir problem, Indira Gandhi nourished it and Rajiv Gandhi made the Kashmir policy he inherited from his predecessors the corner-stone of his Kashmir policy—the policy which is termed as the “appeasement policy”—the policy which has failed India on all fronts. Kashmir crisis reflects just one aspect of the policy the Central leaders have pursued so far. The other aspect presents an equally woeful tale. This tale deals with the impact the appeasement policy has exercised upon Jammu and Ladakh. The only silver-lining in the second case is that while Kashmir is fighting for political emancipation from India, Jammu and Ladakh are struggling hard to joining the mainstream politics to enjoy the fruits of the Indian Democracy and secularism.

Bridge Theory

While to placate the volatile Kashmir and its totally undependable leadership the Congress Government headed by J L. Nehru evolved an appeasement policy, to make Jammu and Ladakh accept the Kashmiri domination in all matters, big or small, and follow the its dictates without any murmur, a what may be termed theory (known as the Bridge theory was discovered. The policy makers refused to accept Jammu as a part and parcel of Jammu and Kashmir State. Instead, it was nicknamed as “Bridge” between Kashmir and India throwing all democratic norms and fundamental principles of secularism to wind. Jammu was made to understand and accept that it was imperative on its part to allow Kashmir to rule it, to exploit it and ply over it whatever be the burden and howsoever painful that might be.

The Bridge Theory was, however, destined to suffer a mischevious failure as it was fraught with dangerous consequences. The theory generated an impression that Kashmir was a territory not in but outside India and that to grab it or pull it towards India Jammu had been tagged to it. Such an impression was bound to send wrong signals to the Kashmiris and their leadership. Fully convinced that the Congress leadership in New Delhi could be easily befooled, exploited

and black-mailed, the NC and its superemo, Sheikh Mohd. Abdullah, adopted a crafty approach to secure as many concessions as possible. So successfully the NC leadership played its game that the Central leaders felt obliged to give whatever the latter wanted. The NC machinations, manipulations and persuasions overpowered J.L. Nehru and secured a special status for Jammu and Kashmir through Article 370 of the Indian Constitution. Though the NC obtained the excessive autonomy, "bordering on sovereignty", in the name of all the people of the State, its chief aim was to rule over Jammu and Ladakh and establish, on the one hand, Kashmir's hegemony over them and black mail, on the other, the Indian Government.

Unable to bear the Kashmir burden, the bridge started crumbling like the house of cards right in the beginning. The resultant outbursts took the shape of the All Jammu and Kashmir Praja Parishad in November 1947, only a month after the State's accession to the Indian Union. The formation of the Praja Parishad immediately after the State accession unambiguously reflected Jammu's anger against Kashmir and the Union Government which had taken the Jammuites and Ladakhis for granted for obvious reasons. However, no heed whatsoever was paid to the Jammu's cries and miseries. Instead, more and more dictatorial powers were conferred on the Kashmiri rulers.

Dictatorial powers coupled with the Centre's unstinted and unqualified support obviously emboldened Sheikh Mohd. Abdullah and other Kashmiri rulers who succeeded him to evolve policies with a view to man all important and unimportant positions in the Kashmir Valley in particular and in the Jammu and Ladakh regions in general. The same policy was to be applied to change the composition and complexion of the State Secretariat wherefrom everything flows. The policy was implemented meticulously. The result was that within a few years the well-calculated and well-designed policy ousted Jammu from the power structure. The policy not only broke the backbone of the bridge but also so worked to the Jamm-

uites' disadvantage as completely to disturb the proportion of Jammu and Kashmir in government employment with Kashmir controlling all the important and more lucrative appointments in the government, in the police, in the revenue department & in the general and political services. This way the Kashmiri leadership started breaking the bridge the Indian Government and other anti-Jammu elements had constructed. Now where is that bridge? Are there any Jammuites in Kashmir to feed trustworthy and timely information to the Governor and his Advisors who are fighting a grim battle with the secessionists in a bid to save Kashmir? Are there any Jammuites and Ladakhis in the State Secretariat and other Government offices in the Valley to counteract the influence the indefinite strike from September 15, 1990, by 1.37 lakh employees belonging to the Valley and to one particular religion in support of the ongoing struggle in Kashmir for 'Azadi' has created? Are there any Jammuites to nullify the impression created in the rest of the country and elsewhere that the whole of the people of Kashmir are with the militants? In fact, the employees strike from September 15 has nailed the Bridge Theory for all the times to come.

Of course, Jammu could have functioned as a bridge between Kashmir and India had it been given its due share in the state power structure and had it been not ousted from the Valley wholesale. The propounders and the protagonists of the Bridge Theory must not forget that only a strong bridge can withstand or sustain the rigours of weight and that a bridge in the construction of which sub-standard material is used must lead to a major and unprecedented disaster. And the crumbling of the Jammu bridge has amply proved it.

Impact

Thus, in October 1947, the NC dispensation-eulogized as a charter of freedom-came as a deadly engine crushing the people of Jammu and Ladakh. Forty three years since then have" meant a nightmarish experience for Jammuites and Ladakhis". All through this period of "legalised colonialism

... the rulers from accross the Pir Panjal have dealt blow after blow" to the polity, economy and identity of Jammu and Ladakh. "A pathological hatred for Jammu and Ladakh and the burning desire of the ruling clique to exploit Jammu and Ladakh has all along been at work".

Backed to the hilt by all the Congress dispensations in New Delhi, the Valley rulers missed no opportunity of piling imbalance after imbalance in Jammu and Ladakh. The Congress which either ruled the State directly or as an affiliate of the NC or as a partner or supporter from outside, always sacrificed the genuine politico-administrative and economic aspirations of Jammu. Always eager for being in power or near the seat of power, the State unit of the Congress which had and still has its mass base in the Jammu region alone, played second fiddle to the Kashmiri leadership. The potent cause which prompted the Congress leadership to ignore Jammu and Ladakh and to please Kashmir was its desire to control or share power, if possible, or to be near the seat of power. So insensitive the Congress leadership became that it could not oppose the Resettlement Bill even. It made no effort at all to seek its withdrawal either as an affiliate of G.M. Shah Government or as a partner in the Farooq's regime. In fact, the Congress leaders consistently betrayed the trust the Jammuites repeatedly reposed in it in the hope that it would protect and further their interests.

The nature of NC-Congress rule created widespread disappointment and dissatisfactions among the Jammuites and Ladakhis, except within a limited circle of the Congress and NC leaders who were (or are) the exploiters or co-exploiters. Under these circumstances the people of Jammu and Ladakh entertained a belief that they were treated as second class citizens and not as citizens proper. They naturally found in the governments of the State and in the machinations of the Central Government a grave threat to their very identity and personality as also to the unity and integrity of the Country. They also entertained a feeling that their sense of patriotism and nationalism had made the Union Government take them

for granted and ignore them with a mere shake of head. In fact, they accused the Government of India of putting on premium the "bullies and political black-mailers". Considering the past history it can be authoritatively asserted that the accusations were and are legitimate.

Forced by the circumstances and feeling of neglect and discrimination, the Jammuites started vibrating with a new zeal, vigour and energy. The anger against Kashmir and the Union Government took the shape of the All Jammu and Kashmir Praja Parishad in November 1947, only a month after the State's accession to the Indian Union. The Praja Parishad did succeed in sabotaging the Sheikh's move for limited accession and releasing forces quite unfavourable for the Valley rulers not only in Jammu but also at New Delhi. But it did not succeed in obtaining any substantial concession to enable Jammu to have an effective say in the law-making, law-enforcing and decision-making bodies.

It was in the late sixties that a number of Jammu's well-wishers again took up the cause of Jammu in right earnest. Balraj Puri, a noted journalist and an expert in Jammu and Kashmir affairs, Anant Ram Shashtri, a prominent personality of Jammu, and Dr. Karan Singh, Ex-Sadr-e-Riayasat, plunged into the arena to demand what Jammu deserved. While Anant Ram Shastri and Dr. Karan Singh advocated Jammu's separation from Kashmir and its amalgamation with Himachal Pradesh, Balraj Puri favoured autonomy for Jammu with protection and promotion of Jammu identity and due share for it in the politico administrative structure of the State as his chief objectives.

It may be pointed out that the idea of autonomy that Balraj Puri advocated was not new. Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerjee, Bhartiya Jana Sangh Chief, had hinted at it in the late forties and early fifties. However, his suggestion was conditional-conditional in the sense that in a number of speeches he delivered in and outside Parliament he had made it loud and clear that in case Kashmir insisted on limited

accession, Jammu must be given autonomy so that it could shape and mould its political destiny itself and become mistress in its own house.

But it was Balraj Puri who gave a shape to the idea and formulated a skeleton scheme embodying reforms to meet the urges of the people of Jammu. Whatever be the shortcomings and drawbacks in the skeleton scheme, his concept of limited autonomy was commendable. Had that Limited autonomy been conferred on Jammu in 1967, the political status of the Jammuites would have been certainly different and not as weak as it is today. Balraj Puri was, however, not destined to accomplish the great task that he had taken in hand. He could not carry people with him. Then another potent factor that failed his concept was the political combinations of the time which sabotaged every effort in the direction of autonomy. Thus Balraj Puri was isolated from the Jammu mainstream.

Balraj Puri was followed by Bhim Singh, who founded the Panthers Party to safeguarding and promoting the interests of Jammu. Launching the party, Bhim Singh like Balraj Puri, declared that the goal of his party was that Jammu should be governed in the best interests of the Jammuites. To achieve his party's goal, he demanded statutory Regional Council with well defined politico-administrative and economic powers. The next to dabble into regional politics was Gulchain Singh Charak who set-up the Jammu Mahasabha with goals more or less similar to those of the Panthers Party.

However, it was towards the end of 1989 and at the beginning of 1990 that the political situation in Jammu took a rather radical turn.

The on-going unprecedented mass upsurge in Kashmir for political redemption, the fear of being submerged under the rising clamours for a plebiscite and restoration of pre-1953 political dispensation and on the top of these the possibility of being ignored once again by the Indian Government while finding out a solution to the Kashmir imbroglio seemed to

have forced the Jammuites to believe that the moment was opportune for them to enter the arena of political agitation, and no longer stay out of it as advised by certain anti-Jammu elements and the advocates of the Bridge Theory. The realisation on the part of the Jammuites that in case they remained dormant and devoid of political life and activity much longer, they would be entirely submerged under the rising tide of an exclusive Kashmiri nationalism was the most significant and natural outcome.

Whatever little hope the Jammuites still had in the Centre got frustrated when George Fernandes, former Union Railway Minister, (also for sometime Minister Kashmir Affairs) and others of his ilk started interfering in Kashmir sending confusing and contradictory signals to the Indian adversaries and letting Jagmohan, the State Governor down in the eyes of the Kashmiris and the Central leaders. The role George Fernandes and many others including Rajiv Gandhi, the Congress President and former Prime Minister, played created widespread resentment, disappointment and commotion and tempers started running very high.

Result

It was under these critical circumstances that M.M. Khajuria and Dr. Virender organised the Jammu People Front and the Jammu Mukti Morcha, respectively. The aims set forth by both the parties were radical. However, of all the regional movements which tended to promote the cause of Jammu, the Jammu Mukti Morcha was, undoubtedly, the most radical. Unlike the Panthers Party, the Jammu Mahasabha, and the Jammu people Front, the Jammu Mukti Morch (JMM) did not suggest a halfway measure. Launching the JMM on March 2, 1990, its organisers rejected the concepts of sub-Statehood and Regional Autonomy as something paltry and illusory and declared in clear terms that they would not accept anything short of Statehood believing that the "political power" was the only solution to the innumerable ills inflicted upon Jammu during the past 43 years. Terming Regional Autonomy,

Sub-Statehood and Regional Development Council as petty or illusory, the organisers opined that such concessions would draw away the Jammuites aspirations. They criticised as impossible and futile, the aim of other parties of convincing the Centre of their claims to autonomy or Sub-Statehood. In fact, they asserted that other parties were striving to do something which in no way would solve the Jammu tangle.

In addition, the JMM founders expressed the opinion that the Centre would not grant substantial reforms or delegate real powers unless and until forced to do so. Making it clear that Jammu "refuse" to accept the position of servitude and subordination for an indefinite period, they declared that their party would not accept any teacher in the art of statehood except the statehood itself.

In fact, the Centre's policy of appeasing and pampering the separatist Kashmiri leadership was responsible more than anything else for the increasing emphasis which the people of Jammu and Ladakh laid on the separation of their regions from Kashmir. Even those who are staunch believers in the doctrine of the unity and integrity of the State now remark that they have not the heart to oppose their brethren when they ask for protection of their economic and constitutional rights. They even privately remark that unless political power is conceded to Jammu and Ladakh, the condition of the people living there cannot be improved and Kashmir cannot be saved. They also admit that time has now come for reviewing interregional relations and evolving some formula where by political aspirations of all the regions are satisfied.

Political Scenario

Political scenario started changing fast after August 1990. Event after event indicated a firm resolve on the part of Jammu and Ladakh to become mistresses in their own houses by severing their political links with the separatist Kashmir as

also their rabid opposition to every move aiming at initiating a dialouge with the secessionists in Kashmir. Event after event reflected their firm determination of linking their political destinies with the rest of Indians and a recognition that whatever advance they seek must be within the framework of the Indian Constitution. The underlying idea behind all developments was to make the Centre realise that Jammu and Ladakh represented two of the three parties to the Jammu and Kashmir dispute.

The September 1 resolution adopted by the Political Conference of the Bhartiya Janta Party (BJP) embodying the party's deepest "concern and anguish over the attempts being made by certain quarters to hold dialouge with the elements who are indulging in terrorist activities for secession of the State from India" "and urging the Centre to "crush secessionist militancy with a firm hand to liquidate Pak-engineered insurgency", the September 1 agreement between the BJP and the Ladakhi Buddhists Association (LBA) to launch a united struggle to break Kashmir's hegemony over the State politics and force the Centre to confer a Union Territory Status on Ladakh and obtain a Statutory Regional Council for Jammu, the September 5 State Janta Dal (JD) Socialist General Secretary, Sheikh Abdul Rehman's repudiation of his own party President, Abdul Qayoom's criticism of the role of para-military forces in Kashmir asserting that "the security forces were doing a commendable job in difficult circumstances to overcome the menace of militancy and restore normalcy in the Valley" and that "there should be absolutely no dialouge with the secessionist elements till they give up arms and declare their full faith in the Constitution", the September 1. Akhil Bhartiya Vidyarthi Parishad's Kashmir March and its advocacy of constitutional safeguards for Jammu and Ladakh as also of strong measures to eliminate pro-Pak elements, the September 16 Seminar on "Jammu as a Separate State" organised by the JMM and participated in and attended to by a number of University Professors, prominent public men and political personalities of all hues, doctors, engineers, advocates and students and last but not the least, the September 17

Noordin Katariya's (State JD Vice-President) outright condemnation of the Centre's apathy towards "patriotic forces" of Jammu and its obsession with "Pleasing the anti-national elements in Kashmir" and his advocacy for a Statutory Development Board for Jammu, not only suggest a change that is currently passing over Jammu and Ladakh but also reflect a remarkable unity of the two against the Centre's wrong policies and Kashmir's discriminatory attitude.

A number of statements issued and opinions expressed by many a prominent NC leaders, like Babu Permanand and Bodh Raj Bali, Ex-Ministers, and Kashmir Singh, MLC, have further brightened the prospects of Jammu unity. The Jammu wing of the NC appears moving identically in the current context. The Congress (I) is the solitary exception which so far has maintained a criminal silence over the miserable plight of the Jammuites and Ladakhis whom they have ruled and represented for over two decades. It appears waiting for an appropriate opportunity to jump into active politics to capture power and office.

The congress's callous attitude notwithstanding, different permutations and combinations being worked out in Jammu and Ladakh amply demonstrate that a change, if not a revolution, is imminent. Although one cannot say with certainty what the change would be or how and when it would come, but one is sure that Jammu and Ladakh should be accepted as two of the Chief factors in the situation and as such should be recognised as powers with which the central government would have to deal and with whose leaders it have to reckon.

Despite such significant developments, Jammu and Ladakh continue to maintain a low profile. The anti-Mandal agitation and the casteist divide and the Communal flare-up in several states in the aftermath of the "Kar Sewa" programme in Ayodhya on October 30, appear to have influenced Jammu-Ladakh leaders not to precipitate crisis for the time being. This apparent lull in politics may not last for long. A single small spark would be enough to provoke a revolt. In short,

the challenge being posed by Jammu and Ladakh seems formidable.

It is, however, Kashmir which is presenting a horrifying spectacle upsetting all calculations of the Government. Authorities do claim that more terrorists are either being killed or apprehended than ever before but this does not seem to be an indication that they would be down and out soon. Reports demonstrate that their ranks continue to swell and that they are bolder than ever before. The terrorists who hitherto used to move generally in small groups, now move in bigger ones without bothering to conceal their weapons. And they move like this not only in the border belt but in all the districts of the Valley. Most of them are no longer underground but are making their presence felt with a deliberate attempt. Groups of them have spread out and based themselves in all the towns. They also have their weaponry available to them easily and the weaponry itself has been upgraded.

The ever-increasing terrorism has provided more grit to militancy and its writ is acknowledged everywhere. The State apparatus seems to be on the defensive and seems prevented from interfering in what the militants do to register their impact. The call for bandh and civil curfew given by the militants is more effective despite show of strength by the Government. Their demonstrations are well attended and their dictates implemented promptly. The secessionists have many supporters and champions who take up their cause publicly. Any direction from the militants is followed and every threat taken seriously. That the militant's writ reign supreme in the Valley is evident from the indefinite strike from September 15 by 1.37 lakh Kashmiri employees. The authorities have lost the count of AK-47 rifles as also of militants and terrorists. And that not many people like to travel or be out of their homes is the ultimate outcome.

Dialouge

Under the circumstances any dialouge on Kashmir would

be an exercise in futility. It is interesting to note that even the protagonists of dialouge themselves have not been able to achieve anything more concrete than mere rhetoric on Kashmir. Of course, they are bringing in certain amount of variety by injecting poetry in their statements during their visits to Kashmir or otherwise.

The necessity and intensity of political talks goes up and down depending on the time and context. In the present surcharged scenarion, the solution to the Kashmir imbroglio is not being sought at all. All that has been done so far and is sought to be done is sloganeering and public posture about which most political parties appear dishonest. They all talk about revival of political process but none has done anything to achieve it. Revival of political process does not mean mere slogan. Public postures do reflect the real political picture. Fears of political parties expressed in private do. The hidden fear fear is basically the result of the present State of law and order. One can go on describing the situation which is grim by all standards. Those sitting in New Delhi know very little of the ground conditions under which the militants are the virtual rulers and will continue to be so whichever form of government is installed. If the Central leaders and certain political parties purpose to find ways of sharing power, it is a futile exercise. There is no power to be shared for AK-47s share power in Kashmir today.

Solution

Insurgency in Kashmir and developments in Jammu and Ladakh thus reflect sharp contradictions and varied response towards India. While Kashmir appears seceding from India, Jammu and Ladakh promise an important chapter in the history of their relations to India.

The Indian Government which has to grapple with a host of delicate constitutional and political issues in solving the Kashmir problem, obviously finds itself saddled with fresh complications arising out of the Jammu-Ladakh problem. Like Kashmir, Jammu and Ladakh too have to be tackled and con-

ciliated. The question of safeguarding the distinct identity of Kashmiris cannot be lost sight of. The Valley has always had a distinct identity of its own. All through history it has been either a separate State or a separate province. It was indeed wrong on the part of the Centre to keep it tagged with Jammu and Ladakh after the link of the common Dogra Crown was removed in 1947.

It is never too late to mend. Kashmir's distinct identity can be safeguarded by separating it from Jammu and Ladakh, who, too, have distinct identities and by giving it the status of a full-fledged State within the Indian Union. It can have equal status but not special status. The special status which it hitherto enjoyed has already created a psychological barrier between Kashmir and the rest of India. This barrier must be destroyed.

What then could be a solution? To arrive at a correct answer, one must study the past—the past from which the present trouble have emanated. It should now be admitted that the 1947 India's decision to allow Srinagar alone to rule Jammu and Ladakh was politically unsound, ethnically undesirable, linguistically unreal, geographically unwise, and economically ruinous. The State consists of three distinct regions—the Kashmir Valley, the Jammu region and Ladakh. The task of tackling the divergent and conflicting aspirations of the people living in these regions in the context of recent developments poses a serious challenge which can only be met if there is mature and sustained thinking by the Government of India, which is conspicuously lacking at present.

The task is difficult indeed but not impossible to perform. The Government of India should convene a conference of leaders of the three regions for the purpose of seeking the greatest possible measure of agreement on the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. Leaders be allowed to review inter-regional relations and their impact and analyse the genesis of the Kashmir crisis, the Jammu tangle and the Ladakh impasse. The Centre should render every possible help to the State.

leaders of all hues in evolving some formula acceptable to all. This is the only possible solution to the present crisis afflicting different regions of the State. ('Jammu-Kashmir and Ladakh : Crisis And Dialouge', *Dally Excelstor*, November 1-17-1990)

Jammu Tangle

The State of Jammu and Kashmir acceded to the Indian Union on October 26, 1947. This historic event, though has been made controversial, was followed by the replacement of Mehr Chand Mahajan by Sheikh Mohd. Abdullah of the Kashmir—based National Conference as the Prime Minister of the State. The Indian Prime Minister, Jawahar Lal Nehru, too, had his role in these political developments of vital importance shaping and moulding the State's political future.

The people, particularly those belonging to the Jammu and Ladakh regions constituting about 50 per cent of the State population and 90 per cent of the State territory had entertained a belief that the rise of Sheikh Abdullah to power would bring happiness to the people irrespective of their caste or creed. There is no denying that the people of the State had suffered owing to the autocratic rule before 1947. The people had hoped that Sheikh Abdullah would evolve sound and rational politico-administrative and economic policies acceptable to all the three regions constituting the State. The hope was based on sound logic for some people then hailed Sheikh Abdullah as a great agitator against autocracy and feudalism and on ardent champion of civil rights and democracy. They had been a witness to the historic role the Sheikh had played during 1931-47. His relentless and courageous struggle against the feudalistic character of

Hari Singh's rule (1925-1947) and his endeavour to pressurising the ruler to introduce reforms leading upto the establishment of responsible government was too fresh to be forgotten. The conversion of the Muslim Conference (1932) into the National Conference (1939) had further fascinated the people of the State.

Nature of rule

But what Sheikh Abdullah and his administration did was altogether contrary to the expectations of the people of Jammu and Ladakh. Political power, decision-making, administration at higher levels, better deal in matters relating to employment, the location of prestigious institutions and funds for development became the privileges of Kashmir alone. In fact, political neglect and gross-discrimination against Jammu and Ladakh became the watchword and corner-stone of the Sheikh's dispensation causing an extreme form of discontent and frustration among the Jammuites and the Ladakhis. His rule, however, did not last long. On August 9, 1953, Sheikh Abdullah was arrested and deposed as Prime Minister of the State on the charge of anti-India activities.

Sheikh Abdullah was replaced by another Kashmiri, Bakshi Ghulam Mohd. His regime lasted till September 1963, when he was dropped under the 'Kamraj Plan'. Bakshi Ghulam Mohd. was followed by Shams-ud-Din who ruled between October 1963 and February 1964. None of these Prime Ministers did anything to ameliorate the lot or to meet the legitimate aspirations of the people of Jammu and Ladakh. In fact, the nature of rule under Bakshi Ghulam Mohd. and Shams-ud-Din did not show any appreciable change.

Ghulam Mohd. Sadiq, who replaced Shams-ud-Din as the Prime Minister in February 1964, filled the hearts of the people with a new hope. His appointment as the Prime Minister of the State was taken by the people to mean the beginning of a new era, full of hope and promise for the future. Ghulam Mohd. Sadiq who is still remembered and hailed by all sections of the people professing different political ideologies

as a true democrat, progressive and secular, proved instrumental in bringing about historic changes leading of Kashmir's unification with India. The National Conference was dissolved and got merged with the Indian National Congress in 1965. At about the same time, the offices of the *Sadar-e-Riyasat* and the Prime Minister were substituted by those of the Governor and the Chief Minister. These historic changes, undoubtedly, brought Jammu and Kashmir State into the national mainstream and facilitated the process of closer ties between India and its Kashmir in the future. The gulf widened between the two during 1947-1964 was, thus bridged to a considerable extent with the national party assuming the reins of the State Administration.

To remove regional imbalances responsible for the bitterness, rancour and animosity among the people inhabiting different regions and to meet the growing politico-administrative and economic aspirations of the people of Jammu and Ladakh, Ghulam Mohd. Sadiq appointed the Gajendragadkar Commission in 1967. The terms of reference of the Commission included :

(i) To make an assessment of the development programmes apportioned to the various regions of the State and to recommend measures necessary to give assurance that the resources available to the State Government are being shared equitably and also to convey a feeling of equal participation in the integrated development of the State.

(ii) To examine the recruitment policies of government and to recommend measures for giving an equitable share in government employment to the various regions and communities, having a special regard to the claim of the scheduled castes and other economically, educationally and socially backward communities, classes and groups among the citizens of the State consistently with the maintenance of efficiency of administration.

(iii) To examine the policies of the State Government regarding admissions to institutions of higher education and

the schemes of assistance by way of scholarships and loans, with a view to ensuring an equitable distribution of the available facilities to the various regions and communities and having special regard to the claims of the Scheduled Castes and other economically and socially backward communities, classes and groups and the citizens of the State.

(iv) And to consider generally the cause that lead to irritations and tensions and to recommend remedial measures.

The Commission after thorough examination admitted in unambiguous terms that Jammu and Ladakh had been victims of political neglect and discrimination. One of its significant observations was "Even if all the matters were equitably settled, we feel that there would still be a measure of discontent unless the political aspirations of the different regions of the State were satisfied." However, it recommended among other things statutory Regional Development Board, Chief Ministership or Deputy Chief Ministership and an engineering college for Jammu Division. The expectations of the people Jammu and Ladakh that the recommendations of commission would be implemented got frustrated for the State Government took no action on the report. The report is still rotting in the Secretariat almirah.

Between December 1971 and January 1990, Syed Mir Qadim, Sheikh Mohd. Abdullah, Farooq Abdullah, G.M. Shah and then again Farooq Abdullah ruled the State. During these 19 years nothing was done to ease the growing regional discontent. Instead the policy of discrimination and neglect was perpetuated and further promoted. The anti-Jammu and communal policies of an extreme form perfecting the Kashmiri domination over the State in all matters reigned supreme. During the period, however, a few commissions, like the Sikri Commission (1980), the Wazir Commission (1981) and the delimitation commission, were appointed.

The Sikri Commission dealt with the intra-regional and inter-regional imbalances and suggested a number of remedial measures to overcome the same. While the Wazir Commission

recommended the creation of three more districts of Kistwar, Reasi and Samba, the Delimitation Commission suggested an increase in the number of assembly and parliamentary constituencies for the Jammu Division. But none of the recommendations found favour with the Valley rulers despite prolonged agitations, banbhs, hunger-strikes and the extreme form of protests through fast-unto-death. (Instead what Jammu had in the form of a few professional and technical institutions was snatched. Who will forget the closure of Agricultural College, R.S. Pura, and the Ayurvedic College, Jammu ?). It needs to be emphasised that, in 1979, the Valley rulers set-up three more districts of Pulwama Badgam and Kupwara in Kashmir with a stroke of pen and that too when there was no demand, protest or demonstration.

The cumulative effect of the political neglect and discrimination against Jammu is the growing discontent, dissatisfaction and anger against the Kashmiri rule. In addition, the policy has radically changed the political perceptions and attitude of the Jammu people. The emergence of regional parties, fronts and morchas to protect and promote the politico-economic aspirations is directly attributed to the Jammu's gross neglect. Even the national parties are finding it extremely difficult to go against the growing regional sentiments.

Regional Parties

The first to raise the banner of revolt against the Kashmiri domination and to safeguarding and promoting the genuine political, administrative and economic interests of the people of Jammu were the Dogra Mandal and the Jammu Autonomy Forum formed by Anant Ram Shastri and a noted journalist, Balraj Puri, respectively. This happened in 1967. While the Dogra Mandal advocated the merger of the Jammu region with Himachal Pradesh, the Jammu Autonomy Forum demanded a vague autonomy. However, nothing came out of these as the demanded of the Dogra Mandal and the Jammu Autonomy Forum failed to find favour either with the Gajendragadkar Commission inquiring into the causes leading to

TABLE 1
Population (1981) Area and Representation

<i>Region</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>Area</i>	<i>Representation</i>			<i>Inhabitants</i>	
			<i>From</i>	<i>Assembly Seats</i>	<i>Inhabitants per seat</i>	<i>Lok Sabha seats</i>	<i>per seat</i>
Kashmir	31,34,904	15,948 Sq. Km.	Kashmir	42	74,000	3	10 Lakh
Jammu	27,18,113	26,293 Sq. Km.	Jammu	31	90,000	2	About 14 lakh
Ladakh	1,34,372	96,701 Sq. Km.	Ladakh	2	67,000	1	1.34 lakh

irritation and bitterness between the regions or with others championing and pleading the Jammu's cause.

Towards the late sixties (1966). Dr. Karan Singh, ex-Sadar-e-Riyasat and former Union Minister, in an interview to the British Press advocated the formation of 'Duggar Pradesh' with Himachal Pradesh and the Jammu region forming its two constituents. But, on being opposed by Dr. Y.S. Parmar, the then Chief Minister of Himachal Pradesh and others, the idea was dropped. Dr. Parmar's opposition to the idea was based on the fact that an advanced Jammu would dominate an under-developed Himachal Pradesh.

The late seventies saw the emergence of Bhim Singh as a regional leader. The Panthers Party that he formed evoked tremendous response from the people of Jammu. Its main demands included setting up of a separate Regional Council with statutory powers on the pattern of Darjeeling Hill Council, a separate Civil Secretariat, scrapping of inter-province seniority rules, separate recruitment Board and Public Service Commission, separate budget and implementation of the recommendations of the Gajendragadkar Commission, the Wazir Commission and the Delimitation Commission. Since then the party is projecting the view point and aspirations of the people of Jammu region besides highlighting gross discrimination and injustice meted out to the Jammuites.

The next to jump into the arena of regional politics of Jammu was the Jammu Mahasabha formed by the Rajput Sabha President, Gulchain Singh Charak, four years ago. The Jammu Mahasabha is a conglomeration of a few social organisations including the Muslim Federation of Abdul Majid with a section of Rajputs forming its main support base. The Jammu Mahasabha is demanding an amendment in the State Constitution to secure devolution of power to the Jammu region right upto the block level. Other demands of the Mahasabha include setting up of Mini-Secretariat at Jammu, appointment of separate heads of all government departments and the formation of a Regional Council on the

pattern of the Darjeeling Hill Council. One of the fundamental objectives of the Jammu Mahasabha is to ease simmering regional tensions and ensure people's participation making them responsible for their own development. In addition, its slogan is: Stop discriminatory attitude towards the Jammu region and ensure its speedier all-round development.

However, the beginning of 1990 saw the emergence of two more regional parties i. e., the Jammu People Front and the radical Jammu Mukti Morcha. While the Jammu People Front was formed on February 18 by M.M. Khajuria, a retired Director General of Police, the Jammu Mukti Morcha was engineered by an academician, Dr. Virender, in collaboration with "prominent citizens including professor, intellectuals, writers, industrialists, advocates, and social workers."

Though the stress of the Jammu people Front has been on securing redressal of Jammu's grievances and ensuring "constitutionally guaranteed devolution of power at the regional level, it has left open for debate the alternatives: (a) sub-state of Jammu within the Jammu and Kashmir State with adequate devolution of power of (b) full-fledged State of Jammu as an integral federating Union of India or (c) regional council on the pattern of Darjeeling Hill Council." It is likely to take a final decision in regard to the option to be chosen for the purpose. The Jammu People Front is attacking the valley rulers and the opposition including the Congress-I for the "stepmotherly treatment" meted out to the people of Jammu. It has in addition promised a struggle to achieve for the people the right for "bright day and brighter tomorrow."

Believing that the people of Jammu have become hostage to the inconstant and fickle sentiments of the leadership of the valley, the Jammu Mukti Morcha has come out with an unambiguous slogan "statehood to Jammu" within Indian Union. It has declared in unequivocal terms that a number of solutions like internal autonomy, sub-statehood, constitutional guarantees of regional rights, hitherto, suggested by various commissions and certain well-meaning but ineffectual intellec-

tuals, are unacceptable. The Jammu Mukti Morcha asserts that there is "no alternative to political power. Jammu must realise its political destiny, and, therefore, the only way to achieve its destiny is autonomy incorporated in full statehood." The Jammu Mukti Morcha's emphatic declaration not to contest elections for it has no confidence in the existing political arrangement has earned for the party public support. The response the Jammu Mukti Morcha getting has emboldened it to even threaten an agitation to press for statehood.

The Jammu Mukti Morcha is of firm opinion that a strong Jammu in this sensitive part of the country is primarily in the national interest. The state-hood to the region will also eliminate the role of religio-regional appeals in politics because the Kashmiri leaders will have then to contend with wooing the Kashmiri electorate and the Jammu politicians the people of Jammu region alone. This will also take away the religio-regional virus from the political working of both the regions which in turn will promote sound politics on purely economic, political and democratic issues. In such a situation the Kashmiri psyche will become less vulnerable to the syncretic, pulls of fundamentalism from Pakistan. The separate Jammu state would give a befitting rebuff to Pakistan for its nefarious propaganda of 'Azadi' and plebiscite and ill-designs to capture Jammu & Kashmir and would ensure peace and amity in the Jammu region.

Resentment against the Kashmiri domination is also brewing among other semi-political and socio-Cultural groups such as the Shiv Sena, the Arya Samaj, the Chamber of Commerce and Industries, the Small Scale Industries Association, the Jammu and Kashmir Sahayata Samiti, the Dharmik Yatra Samiti, the newly formed Jammu Praja Parishad and the Jammu Peace Force, a youth wing of the Jammu Mahasabha and the Hindu Manch. While the Shiv Sena's local and central leadership is favouring Statehood to Jammu, the leaders of other organisations and social groups are advocating "son of the soil" theory.

TABLE-II
**Chief Ministers till Jan. 1990, Presidents Political Parties, Secretaries/
 Commissioners and Services**

<i>Chief Ministers</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>Presidents</i>			<i>Secretaries/ Commissioners</i>	<i>Employees in Secretariat</i>	<i>Employees in Kashmir Division Services</i>	<i>Employees in Jammu Division Services</i>
		<i>N.C.</i>	<i>Congress/ Congress (I)</i>	<i>Political Parties Janta Dal</i>				
Kashmir	9	All	All-(I)	1	About 25	About 90%	About 98%	About 40%
Jammu	—	—	1	—	2 or 3	About 10%	About 2%	About 60%
Others	—	—	—	—	About 5	—	—	—

National Parties

Sensing erosion of their support-base and the tremendous response the regional parties are getting, the national parties too have started supporting and further arousing regional sentiments. The State unit of the Bhartiya Janata Party has favoured Separate statehood for Jammu as a solution to its present sense of deprivation and neglect at the "hands of successive state regimes dominated by the Kashmiri leadership". The immediate provocation for such an extreme posture is, of course, the ongoing struggle in Kashmir for independence and the central ministers' insistence on initiating a dialogue with the militants. The sponsors of the idea are of the opinion that the time is opportune for making such a demand.

However, Kidar Nath Sahni and Krishan Lal Sharma, All India General Secretaries of the Bharatiya Janata Party, have expressed themselves differently. Kidar Nath Sahni addressing a Press Conference at Jammu on June 7, 1990, characterized the demand of statehood of Jammu as 'Just' but with some doubts as to its timing. Krishan Lal Sharma, on the other hand, announced at Jammu on June 28, that he did not favour the idea in the existing circumstances. Efforts are, however, on to create a consensus within the party over the demand of statehood for Jammu. The idea is also reported to have gained favour with the faction led by the former Party President, Thakur Baldev Singh. That the growing regionalism in Jammu has influenced the thought pattern of the Bharatiya Janata Party is evident from the support it extended to the strike engineered by the Junior Doctors Association, Jammu, against the migrant medicos.

The leaders of the State unit of the Janata Dal and Congress (I) have begun to support the idea of statehood to Jammu, though indirectly. Both the parties are voicing deep concern over the alleged adjustment of Kashmiri migrant officials against the posts of Jammu Province. The demand of both the parties that all the posts meant for Jammu Divi-

sion "should be filled only with the employees of the province and not from the outside eloquently proves their design of exploiting the regional sentiments to regain the ground lost. Both the parties have denounced in unequivocal terms the appeasement policy towards Kashmiris ignoring the cause of Jammu. The Janata Dal leaders have even gone to the extent of threatening a stir in case the government fail to reconsider its policy. The leaders of the Provincial unit of the National Conference too have urged the governments at the centre and state to pay due attention for overall development of Jammu region "expeditiously."

Publicmen

Prominent publicmen and politicians including Prof. Balraj Madhok, the Jana Sangh leader, Syed Shahabuddin, Convener, Babri Action Committee, and Balraj Puri, Chairman, State Unit of People's Union for Civil Liberties (PUCL) too, have extended their support to the View point and aspirations of Jammu and Ladakh, of course, in with somewhat different context.

Prof. Balraj Madhok is suggesting the reorganisation of Jammu and Kashmir State so as to give Statehood to Kashmir and Jammu and Union territory status to Ladakh. He asserts that the reorganisation will "safeguard the Kashmiri identity and satisfy the aspirations of the people of Jammu & Ladakh". Syed Shahabuddin, on the other hand, regards the state of Jammu and Kashmir an accident of history. It has no inherent unity. He is advocating trifurcation of the State realising that the compulsions and aspirations of Jammu and Ladakh are totally different from those of Kashmir. Balraj Puri is also advocating measures to preserve Jammu identify either through "formal institutional arrangements, like formation of a Regional Advisory Committee or through an informal arrangement." The vague autonomy that he is advocating has, so far, failed to win any adherent.

New element

The ongoing upsurge in the Valley, the recent thinking at the centre of starting political process involving Farooq Abdullah, militants and others, the recent bomb-blasts and shooting incidents in Jammu master minded by the subversives and pro-Pakistani elements and the reported move to adjust Kashmiris against the posts meant for Jammu division have added a serious elements to the already tense situation giving further impetus to the extreme demand of statehood to Jammu.

The developments have made the people of Jammu believe that they would once again be ignored by the Central Government. The memories of 1952 Delhi Agreement, the 1975 Indira-Sheikh Accord and the 1987 Rajiv-Farooq Accord are too fresh to be forgotten. Each one of these stories have been that of betrayal of the people of Jammu. Everytime the Central and Kashmiri leaders, made solemn pledges to respect the personality of Jammu and safeguard their legitimate rights. Unfortunately, the action of the power-that-be whether in Kashmir, or in Delhi gave a lie to the pronouncements made with full solemnity.

The people of Jammu now witnessing an unprecedented unity against the Kashmiri domination believe that this is the time for action and if they remained dormant or devoid of political life and activity any more, they would be completely submerged under the rising clamours for 'Azadi', a plebiscite and restoration of 1953 political-arrangement. Will the Central and state government review their policy and analyse the Jammu tangle? A superficial study will be enough to determine the extent to which has Jammu been exploited politically, administratively and economically. Further neglect and exploitation of Jammu would not only complicate the already most complex Kashmir problem and hamper the much-needed process of normalisation but would also prove highly dangerous. In the event of further neglect, Jammu may develop into another volatile Kashmir or Assam.

Jammu region has, so far, displayed extraordinary patience. But then, even thing has a limit. The governments at the centre and in the State must review their policy and take immediate necessary steps to mollify the sentiments of the Jammuities which stand injured and frustrated. A positive gesture would remove the impression the Jammuities have entertained that both the governments are favourably inclined towards Kashmir alone having nothing to do with the Jammuities except to rule them by suppressing their aspirations, sentiments and politico-economic interests. Nothing would be more unfortunate than that the governments should fail to recognise the signs of the time and to feel the pulse of the people of Jammu. Time is passing and there is enough reason to fear that unless some sound move is made, the best opportunity for action would be lost.

The on-going turmoil in the Valley of Kashmir should not be viewed in isolation from the geo-political crisis that dominates the distinct heterogeneous entities of Ladakh and Jammu. Each region has its own identity and even while the Kashmiri dimension seems to pre-occupy, political imagination today, the crisis afflicting the Jammu and Ladakh regions cannot and must not be overlooked. The political leaders and the Indian Government must realise that a trifurcation of the, State into Jammu and Kashmir and Ladakh States would go a long way in achieving the much needed national unity and integrity, which is today standing in a most precarious position.¹

1. *Daily Excelsior*, Jammu, August 2-4, 1990.

Gajendragadkar Perception

The emergence of the demand of 'statehood for Jammu' in March 1990 has evoked response and reaction on expected lines. While a section of well-meaning personalities is seeing a solution to the ills afflicting Jammu in regional autonomy, an equally important section of non-political persons is favouring statehood believing in the doctrine that nothing short of statehood would meet the legitimate requirements and urges of the people of this rather neglected region. There is yet another class of well-wishers of the region and ardent champions of the unity and integrity of the State. This wants the Central Government to invoke Art. 371 of the Indian Constitution and establish Regional Development Boards for all the three regions, viz. Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh. To doubt the sincerity of this class would be to harm the noble cause of Jammu. At the same time it is pertinent to mention that this section is perhaps unaware of the utter failure of such boards created in the unified Panjab to fulfil the aspirations of what today constitute Haryana, Himachal Pradesh and Punjab and their subsequent elevation to the status of full fledged statehood.

What is causing concern is the apprehension expressed by some participants in the ongoing debate whether Jammu should clamour for autonomy or statehood that the trifurcation of the State into Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh states would

automatically culminate in the division of the population on communal lines. This misconceived perception can be cut to its size if analysed in the light of the secular and democratic character of the Indian polity and the arguments the protagonists of the statehood have advanced. This unrealistic perception is based on the belief that the Muslims of this accidental State are a race apart. This category of participants has advertently or inadvertently posed wrong questions and given wrong answers. The only silver-lining in the case under reference is its unequivocal admission that Jammu has been and is still being ignored in all walks of life by the so-called secular, democratic, and unbiased Valley leadership. This school also finds a lasting solution to the Jammu problem in autonomy as it, according to it, would make Jammu a mistress in her own house and enable her to enjoy the fruits of development unhindered.

Anyway, the roads, though diverging from each other, lead towards the same destination, i.e., political power for Jammu. One of the most important features of the continuing debate on the subject is the passionate plea of prominent citizens like Prof. M.L. Kapur, Cmdr. A.S. Jamwal and Mr. P.C. Gupta, for a healthy discussion on the epoch-making subject avoiding any kind of acrimony. The difference of opinion notwithstanding, the slogan of 'statehood for Jammu' or the trifurcation of the state has continued unabated. The slogan has certainly prompted all-right thinking people and well-wishers of the trouble-torn State in general and of Jammu in particular to analyse dispassionately the genesis of the present impasse in Kashmir, the Jammu tangle and the Ladakh simmering and the potent causes leading to such an extreme slogan to trifurcation.

The demand of 'statehood for Jammu', weakness in the intensity of the movement notwithstanding, and the current debate on the topic in the columns of the esteemed *Daily Excelsior* and *Kashmir Times* has brought home one significant and unanimous observation i.e., the politico-administrative and economic impoverishment of the people of the region. In such

a confused situation people are naturally asking questions on as to which of the options would be better for them to avail of. The questions and supplementary questions asked are urgent and necessarily important. Some eminent participants have sometimes missed the basic questions whose answers are essential to understand the nature and cause of the curse perpetrated on Jammu.

An easy jump to a brief conclusion that trifurcation of the state would automatically lead to the division of the inhabitants on purely communal lines is highly superficial and unbelievable. There are many other questions to which quick and flimsy answers are being provided by certain participants in the debate. Instead of dealing with abstract and hypothetical questions we should try to concentrate on a million-dollar question : Why do Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh clamour for statehood, 'Azadi' and Union Territory status, respectively.

The question is indeed simple and straight. To find out a logical answer we have to go back to October 1947 when the New Delhi's unrealistic decision threw Jammu and Ladakh in the lap of arrogant, haughty, communal, undemocratic and absolutely bias Kashmir leadership-leadership which had displayed rancour, ill-will and animosity towards Jammu not very long ago. Who in Jammu doesn't know the implications and the outcome of the 1946 Quit Kashmir Movement the Kashmir based National Conference (NC) launched? It may be recalled that the said revolt was not directed against the British but against Jammu to which the contribution of the Indian National Congress was far from unimportant.

The New Delhi judgement obtained for the NC a golden opportunity to compensate for the alleged losses Kashmir had suffered under Maharajas Gulab Singh (1846-57), Ranbir Singh (1857-85), Pratap Singh (1885-1925) and Hari Singh (1925-47). The Valley leaders evolved policies which were detrimental and grievous for the legitimate interests and needs of the people of Jammu and Ladakh. In the pursuit of its

anti-Jammu and Ladakh policies, the NC leadership was ably backed by New Delhi and the so-called popular representatives from the Jammu region who consistently and persistently played a dubious role of Kashmir's henchmen by ditching the faith the Jammuites pinned in them hoping against a hope that they would not only safeguard their legitimate interests, constitutional and economic, but would also promote them. The cumulative effect of the total indifference and apathy shown towards Jammu by the Central Government, the Kashmir leadership and their lieutenants in Jammu was the rise of widespread discontent, dissatisfaction and frustration among all Jammuites irrespective of the area and religion to which they belonged. The emergence of the Jammu and Kashmir Praja Parishad (1947), the Jammu Autonomy Forum (1967) and the Dorga Mandal (1967) was clearly the manifestation of Jammu's anger against the three deadly engines, Indian Government, Kashmir Government and Jammu leaders.

The demand of autonomy for Jammu or separation of Jammu from Kashmir and its amalgamation with Himachal Pradesh in 1967 would not have cropped up at all had the Congress leadership at the Centre not thrown Jammu at the mercy of the hostile Kashmir or had the Kashmir leadership not trampled Jammu's inherent rights, denied privileges it deserved and controverted requests it made by purchasing leaders and had the leadership considered the Jammuites as citizens proper.

Ghulam Mohd. Sadiq, who succeeded Shamas-Ud-Din as the State Prime Minister in February 1964, was perhaps the first Kashmiri leader who realised the grave implications of the growing discontent and anger among the Jammuites as also of various political movements of far reaching importance surfaced in the 1960's. In fact, Sadiq was one of these rare Kashmiris who was inspired by a genuine feeling of sympathy for the interest, and welfare of Jammu. He possessed an exceptional and deep knowledge of what was going on below and above the surface. He knew that the existing Government administered on autocratic lines was dangerously out of touch with the masses and that there was an imminent danger of violent

revolt which might endanger the unity and integrity of the State. From well-wishers, he apparently received warnings of the danger to the Government, and to the future welfare of the State, from the economic and political sufferings of the masses, and the alienation of the enlightened Jammuites. In short, Sadiq knew the inside story and discerned the wave of popular discontent which had become a potential danger after 1952.

The fear of another revolutionary revolt of the type the Kashmir leadership had witnessed in 1952—53, and the memories of the Jammu Satyagraha which still lingered in his mind or which still haunted him prompted Sadiq to devise some strategy to overcome such an eventuality and ameliorate the politico-economic and social lot of the Jammuites. The first step that he took to rescue the Jammuites from their pitiable condition was the appointment on November 6, 1957 of a Commission of Inquiry headed by Dr. P.B. Gajendragadkar (Bombay). Two other members, who were nominated on the Commission, were Shanker Prasad (New Delhi) and Badr-Ud-Din Tyabji (Hyderabad). B.P. Bagchi, ICS, was made the Secretary to the Commission.

The subjects which the State Government referred to the Gajendragadkar Commission for consideration, probe and suggestions were :

“(A) To make assessment of the development programmes apportioned to the various regions of the State and to recommend measures necessary to give assurance that the resources available to the State Government are being shared equitably and also to convey a feeling of equal participation in the integrated development of the State.

(B) To examine the recruitment policies of Government and to recommend measures for giving an equitable share in government employment to the various regions and communities, having special regard to the claim of the Scheduled Castes and other economically, educationally and socially backward communities, classes and groups among the citizens of the

State consistently with the maintenance of efficiency of administration.

(C) To examine the policies of the State Government regarding admissions to institutions of higher education and the schemes of assistance by way of scholarships and loans, with a view to ensuring an equitable distribution of the available facilities to the various regions and communities, having special regard to the claims of the Scheduled Castes and other economically, educationally and socially backward communities, classes and groups among the citizens of the State.

(D) To consider generally the causes that lead to irritation and tensions and to recommend remedial measures”.

To acquaint itself of the ground situation prevailing in Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh, and to get a first hand knowledge of the conditions and disabilities of the people, the members of the Commission visited different parts of the State. The visits of the member' members during June-September 1968 to such remote areas as Leh and Kargil in Ladakh and Doda, Kishtwar, Bhadarwah, Poonch and Rajouri in the Jammu Division, almost came as a fulfilment to the requests made by certain representatives of the areas. At each one of these far off places member/members held series of talks with officials and non-officials to ascertain their views on the matters agitating the mind of the people. During these tours the members were presented with memoranda and representations embodying details on the problems, local or otherwise, the people faced.

Before completing the report the Commission also held detailed discussions at Jammu with Chief Minister G.M. Shah, his Cabinet Colleagues and senior Government officials of the State to ascertain their views on the issues afflicting different regions of the State. The parleys continued for full six days from August 22 to 27, 1968. The Commission took about a year to complete various formalities which included among other things the receipt of memoranda, petitions, represen-

tations and charter of demands and the recording to statements of various persons and leaders representing various associations and organisations, political or otherwise. The Commission finally met at Bombay for five days in November 1968 to complete the work and finalise the Report, popularly known as the Gajendragadkar Commission Report (1968).

It needs to be highlighted that the Commission in all received ninetythree memoranda. A little over one-third of the memoranda were from the Valley, fifty-one from the Jammu region and just four from Ladakh. While only five (two from Jammu city and one each from Srinagar, Udhampur and Rajouri) memoranda were from political parties, twelve emanated from various "communal" bodies. Of the rest, a little less than one-third were submitted by associations, unions and communities, while the bulk of the remaining fortyseven were from individuals or group of individuals. Whereas forty memoranda were essentially of general nature and dealt with the regions and their problems, twentyeight had a "communal bias" and related to protection and promotion of certain communal interests.

An examination of both the petitions and charter of demands and statements recorded by individuals and associations' representatives give expression to various grievances and problems which may be classified under four major headings, namely : (A) Development and Regional Bias, (B) Employment and Kashmiri Domination, (C) Education and Discrimination and (D) Irritants responsible for rancour, ill-will and animosity between the regions.

(a) Development and Bias

The development policy the State Government, and in particular its policy relating to Jammu and Ladakh and their hilly and inaccessible areas was one of the major points of sharp criticism. The memorialists from Jammu and Ladakh took a keen interest in the controversy relating to development. They strongly felt that the Kashmiri dominated Government, in pursuit of its developmental policy was directed more by the

Valley than by Jammu and Ladakh interests, and that the far reaching effects of the policy of gross-discrimination and neglect affected the development of the two regions, which could otherwise have been developed had there been sufficient constitutional safeguards.

The memorialists from Jammu condemned the developmental policy due to several reasons. Firstly, the tourist spots of the region were woefully neglected; secondly, irrigation projects taken up there for implementation were fewer although the area under cultivable land in Jammu region was much larger than that in Kashmir; thirdly, expenditure incurred on the irrigation schemes in Jammu was "disproportionately low and inadequate"; fourthly, the attention paid towards the construction of roads and bridges, generation of power and installation of industries was far insufficient as compared to what the Government did in the valley particularly when considered in the light of the extreme backwardness of the Jammu region; and lastly, drinking water facilities were not available in the Kandi area of the Jammu region.

The grievances listed by the Ladakhis were almost identical. Explaining the position of Ladakh, its representatives strongly urged the Commission that the Ladakhis' position in the structure of representative Government and in the State should commensurate not merely with their numerical strength but also with the importance of Ladakh as a "delicate strategic area" deserving "special care and deft handling". Apprising the members of the Commission of the problems the Ladakhis faced, the memorialists stressed the importance of providing transport facilities, the prime need of the area, as the same were "Woefully inadequate" as also of ensuring enough electricity on a stable basis and devising some mechanism "where by the funds allocated to Ladakh for developmental purpose were properly utilised and did not lapse". Yet another significant suggestion the representatives of the area made was that "the status of Ladakh should be formally recognised by including 'Ladakh' in the name of the State" so that it could be called State of Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh.

(B) Employment and Kashmir

Employment in Government services had been (and continues to be) one of the most important topics of serious discussion in Jammu. Jammu could not ignore this vital problem on which most of its other problems were dependent. Indeed, employment problem besides neglect in political matters and unprecedented imbalances in developmental programmes formed the very root of the politics in Jammu resulting in an extreme form of inter-regional bitterness, irritation and ill-will.

One of the major accusations against the highly prejudicial State rulers related to gross "discrimination on communal and regional grounds in recruitment, favouritism, nepotism in promotions and lack of reservations for the Scheduled Castes and backward classes". The reproach Jammu forcefully urged against the biased ruling clique that "frequently even peons, forest guards and patwaries from Kashmir were posted in the Jammu region as though qualified persons to fill such posts could not be locally found" was far more startling.

To substantiate their charges against the preferential and differential treatment shown towards the Kashmiris, the memorialists from Jammu cited numerous instances of "unjust supersessions in the matters of promotions". They indicted the Kashmiri dispensation in unequivocal terms that "Kashmiris with inferior qualifications were being preferred to better qualified persons in Jammu". Casting "aspersions on the impartiality and fairness of the Public Service Commission (PSC)", they even went to the extent of demanding that the PSC be "consists of members appointed from outside the State".

To overcome the onslaught perpetrated due to the partisan employment policy, do away with the Kashmiri supermacy and obtain justice for Jammu, certain political groups advocated the theory of proportional representation or "region-wise representation in the services" maintaining that such an

innovation would protect Jammu against exclusion by Kashmir besides enabling all large and important sections of the population to enjoy share in proportion to their ratio to the total population. Communal bodies and certain communities like Gujjars, Rajputs, Shias and Christians, on the contrary, favoured reservations on communal basis or special quotas.

It needs to be emphasised that there had been a large expansion of services after the introduction of the so-called popular rule in the State in October 1947. With the expansion of the services commenced an era full of glaring instances where recruitment was made "without observing usual formalities". What was most disgusting and unbelievable was the appointments in the higher ranks from political cadres.

The non-observance of the recruitment rules and the appointment of collaborators of the ruling elite to man and control the Government, the revenue department, the judicial and police administration and the political services of the State started with the installation of Sheikh Abdullah as the State Prime Minister, obviously, adversely affected the prospectus of Jammu people. Within a few years of the State accession to the Indian Union, the calculated strategy concerning employment so worked to the disadvantage of the Jammuites as completely to reverse the proportion of the two major regions of the State in Government employment. While the Kashmiris took full advantage of the State and Central patronage, the Jammuites suffered a grievous injury and left out in the cold.

The nature of the recruitment policy the Kashmiri dominated Government evolved and meticulously pursued can be judged from the boorish statement Bakshi Ghulam Mohd., Prime Minister of the State from 1953 to 63, made: "Merit could not be the sole criterion in these matters, for if merit were made the sole criterion there would be no place for the Muslims..."

It can be legitimately asserted that right on the day one the Valley leadership dismissed the Jammuites as third class.

citizens unworthy of any consideration or privilege. Even more intriguing was the coldness and stoicism towards the Muslims of the Jammu region. As a matter of fact, the Kashmiri leaders and the destiny-moulders never considered the Muslims of Jammu a part and parcel of their movement. A visit to Doda, Kishtwar, Bhadarwah, Rajouri and Poonch in the Jammu division would be enough to discern the pitiable condition in which the people, mostly the Muslims are languishing for want of justice and fair play. A cursory glance at the present plight of Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs and other communities inhabiting Jammu and their proportion in the State services is more than sufficient to determine the extent to which they have been ignored.

(C) Education and Discrimination

Wanton discrimination and the resultant impediments and difficulties in the way of the education and social progress of the Jammuites were the other subjects of frequent discussion and sharp criticism. The charter of demands submitted not only highlighted all the conceivable obstacles the pro-Kashmir rulers had placed to add to the backwardness of the Jammuites but also accused them of "discrimination on the basis of regions and religions in the matter of admission to higher educational and professional institutions", denial of "professional colleges" to the Jammu region and total discouragement "to the backward classes to acquire higher education".

The charter of demands censured the Government levelling grave charges that the scholarships had been easily made available to those hailing from Kashmir, but to discourage the Jammuites considerable obstacles had been placed. The State Government, the memorialists asserted, had, so far, granted many scholarships for advanced studies and training in India and abroad, but these grants had invariably gone to the Kashmiris and the Jammuites had been left out in the cold. The story of selection of candidates for training abroad was no different. Several parties from Jammu, Particularly the

Students Congress (SC) complained that "all the technical colleges are located in Kashmir".

In short, the Jammuites were in a miserable condition. Their educational needs were woefully neglected. To those who in the face of all discouragement completed their courses, State services were denied and thus the chief incentive taken away. This was the background in which the representatives from Jammu in general and the SC in particular strongly urged the Commission to ensure "the establishment of such (technical and professional) institutions in their own region". A very significant suggestion of the SC related to the creation of a separate University in Jammu to cater to the needs of the Jammu students. According to the SC the creation of a separate University and the establishment of technical and professional institutions was greatly needed by the Jammuites for there was no hope of fair play for them within the folds of Kashmir or in alliance with it.

Recognising the supreme importance of education and the role it plays in the alround development of the society, the Jammuites sought the help and co-operation of the commission in ensuring new policy to suit the growing and special needs of the educationally backward region of Jammu.

(d) Irritants

Of all the issues afflicting Jammu, the one related to "legitimate regional aspirations" was, undoubtedly, the foremost. The reason was not far to seek-full integration of Jammu, with India had been the chief aspiration of Jammu, and its people put forward the complete unification with India in the forefront of their programme, for the integration was taken to be the surest pledge that the night of discontent and despaire would draw to its close and a new day of just hopes and rational aspirations on the part of Jammuites and of a patient and sympathetic consideration of their claims to all right of democracy on the part of the government would dawn.

The wrangle concerning political aspirations together with the issue of an effective say in the politics of the State had generated intense rancour, animosity and tensions between Jammu and Kashmir and between the latter and Ladakh. Reflecting (and continues to reflect) the nature of Kashmir's sway over Jammu, the controversy brought to the fore sharp and contradictory attitudes the two had towards the question of the State's relation with India.

Virtually no share to Jammu in the politico-administrative apparatus and non-fulfilment of its cherished goal of more anything else for the increasing emphasis which the Jammuites from 1947 onwards laid on their empowerment so that they could shape and mould their political destiny unhindered. The formation of the Praja Parishad (PP) and the Satyagraha it launched in 1952-53 was the first major step Jammu took to achieve the objectives. Dismissal of Shaikh Abdullah and his subsequent detention on August 9, 1953, was the partial fruition of the efforts Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerji, Pt. Prem Nath Dogra and a band of devoted followers made.

However, the Jana Sangh which substituted the PP did not much to obtain Jammu's inherent political and economic rights. Its firm belief in the unity and integrity of the State and the fear of Kashmir secession perhaps stood in the way. Its rabid opposition to autonomy for Jammu based on the notion that such a reform would ultimately promote secessionism in Kashmir and make it more vulnerable to Pak's evil designs proved counter-productive and in no way helped India check the growing fissiparous tendencies and curbing anti-India feeling.

Had the JS supported the idea of autonomy and fought vigorously for Jammu's share it rightfully deserved in the structure, the political status of Jammu would have been totally different from what it is today. It would, in addition, have eliminated the role of religio-regional virus and encouraged sound and healthy politics both in Kashmir and in Jammu centred round democratic and economic issues. The JS's failure in submitting a petition before the Commission demanding

justice and fair play-for reasons best known to it-failed Jammu miserably.

Certain weaknesses notwithstanding, the supreme importance of Jammu's empowerment was emphasised by the Jammu Autonomy Form (JAF). Its very inception was based on the fear of Kashmir and threat it posed to the identity of Jammu. The JAF explained it and made it the corner-stone of its philosophy. It made it loud and absolutely clear that the time had come when a fullerscope might be given to the expression of Jammu's views and the representation of its opinion. The Dogra Mandal (DM) went a step further when its leader argued before the 1967 Commission that the goal of his party was to see Jammu's separation from Kashmir and its merger with Himachal Pradesh as also that Jammu should be governed in the best interests of the Jammuites.

The basic difference between the JAF and the DM, thus, centred round whether Jammu should be separated from Kashmir or not to meet its legitimate political urges, compulsions and needs. While the JAF saw the solution to the ills facing Jammu in autonomy within the State, the DM on the other extreme, thought as impossible and futile, the aim of the former of convincing the Kashmir rulers of the justice to its claims and advocated no truck with Kashmir.

It needs to be recalled that one of the chief factors held squarely responsible for Jammu's political neglect and its inability to enter the nation mainstream was the Shaikh's intrigue to become de-facto rulers of the State. In his crafty endeavours, the Sheikh was ably supported by Pt. Nehru, Indian Prime Minister. In fact, Pt. Nehru had obsession with the Sheikh. Infamous Art. 370 of the Indian Constitution was certainly the culmination of the conspiracy Pt. Nehru and the Sheikh had hatched to create Kashmir republic within the Indian Republic. The Sheikh became the Sultan not only of Kashmir but also of Jammu. Demolishing the very foundation of the Indian secularism, the separatist Article rendered the Jammuites ineffective and unreal for all practical purposes. The status of Jammu

between 1953 and 67 remained more or less the same.

And no wonder that some parties which represented Jammu before the Commission strongly felt that the special status conferred on the State through Article 370 was the chief cause responsible for the growth of fissiparous tendencies in Kashmir Jammu's around degeneration. Condemning it as most dangerous and suicidal, they impressed upon the Commission the necessity and importance of the abrogation of the separatist and over-riding Article.

The controversy naturally culminated in the surfacing of conflicting and mutually exclusive perceptions. While "several parties" from Jammu urged the Commission to "remove Art. 370 from the Constitution as it indirectly retard the process of the complete integration of the State.....in the Indian Union" and favoured its placement "on the same footing as the other States in the Indian Union" were, those from Kashmir denounced the cries for its (Article's) abrogation as "irredentism, chauvinism and revivalism" and sought from the Commission an unqualified commitment to the effect that "the special status conferred on the State by this Article" would "not be tempered with....." Further, while the parties from Jammu argued that no other State had an independent Constitution of its own and that the existence of an independent Constitution for Jammu and Kashmir had "an adverse effect upon the process of complete integration of the State in the Indian Union", those hailing from Kashmir advocated its retention arguing that the Valley dreaded Indian domination.

Jammu and Kashmir were thus essentially different not only in their most important objects but also in their *modus operandi*. The controversy proved beyond doubt that the two had such divergent opinions and that they had constituted the State just by an accident of history. It can be authoritatively said that Kashmiris for some reason or the other held aloof from India. The changes such as the extension of the jurisdiction of the Centre from the original three subjects of defence, foreign affairs and communications to all the subjects

in the Union List (1957); the All India Services (1958); jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and Comptroller and Auditor General of India (1958); the functions of the election Commission of India, not only for elections to the Parliament and the office of the President and Vice-President of India, but also elections to the State Assembly; Art. 356 and 357 of the Indian Constitution containing provisions relating to the failure of the Constitutional machinery; and the change in the designations from Sadre-e-Riasat and Waziriaazam to Governor and Chief Minister (1965), which the people of Jammu had most cheerfully acquiesced and welcomed, were regarded by the Kashmiris as deep personal wrongs and denounced them as cunning devices to systematically erode the Autonomy-bordering sovereignty-of the State guaranteed by Art. 370. In other words, while Jammu hailed the changes as bold well-meaning steps, the same were condemned by Kashmir as the principal cause of irritation and tension between India and Kashmir.

Conflicting Attitude

What could have been far more amazing and commendable than that Jammu should reiterate its unstinted allegiance with India despite an extreme form of indifference and emotionlessness it had shown towards the former's very genuine and rightful politico-economic urges during the past 20 years. Over-fed Kashmir, on the other extreme, presented an absolutely disturbing and alarming spectacle. The demands its spokesmen put forth were at complete variance with those of Jammu and Ladakh.

An examination of the petitions presented and the statements made before the Commission, undoubtedly, reveals that the Kashmir's grievances were more of politico-secessionist nature than of economic. It bears recalling that Kashmir had not submitted even a single memo focussing its economic backwardness or unemployment of its youth. This striking feature itself indicates the extent to which the Kashmiris were satisfied with the pace of developmental activities going on since 1947.

The major issues the Kashmiri spokesmen sought the Commission to acquaint with were three in number—firstly, the Durbar should not be allowed to move to winter capital of the State i.e. ; Jammu, “as the practice of Durbar move... gives a feeling of isolation and neglect to the people of Kashmir during the winter months when the Valley is snowbound” ; secondly, a complete reversal of “political policy of the Union Government towards Kashmir” to eliminate the element of “doubt in the mind of the Kashmiris about their political future”, and no mediation whatever in the State affairs on the part of “leaders of India”; and, thirdly, “a larger measure of autonomy for the State”.

The demands raised and the fear about their political future expressed by Kashmir representatives, in fact, reflected nothing but black-mailing on their part in favour of the already well-nourished Kashmir which had been exploiting the Jammu Province, economically and politically, all those 20 years of independence which should have been a glow of independence and happiness to Jammu. But what do we find ? Crores of rupees New Delhi pumped in the State had fed and fattened only the politicians and bureaucrats and the middlemen in the Valley and a few of their henchmen in Jammu with not even crumbs to the people of Jammu. India had been and continues to be extremely generous to Kashmir. Who is unaware that no where in India, rice and wheat (Atta) for years had been given in ration at paise 60 a KG.

Even today, the entire dependence of Kashmir is on the drain of India including Jammu and their resources. Its mentor, fundamentalist and political God father Pakistan, cannot feed the Valley even for a week. The tourist industry and sale of fruit in the Indian markets save Kashmir from starvation. India must boldly ask the Kashmiris to look the facts in the face and the latter must face the truth. The self-inflicted pinch has already started pinching the common Kashmiris who, in subdued tones, have commenced murmuring : “Azadi hai ke barbadi.”

Disproportionate development in Kashmir in the sphere rela-

TABLE—I
Expenditure : Agriculture, Irrigation, Education & Health, Area under Cultivation and Irrigation

Power and Industries—IIInd and IIIrd Plan Period

Region	Expd. Agricultur- al progra- mme	Expd. Agricul- ture	Expd. Irrigation	Expd. Education	Expd. Health	Area under cultivation and Irrigation (1965)		Power Installed capacity (1965)	Towns Electrified Industries (Units)
						Net Cultivable	Net Irrigated		
Kashmir	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.				
	349.09 Lac	134.38 Lac	777.61 Lac	425.59 Lac	208.43 Lac	819,000 Acres	519,000 Acres	130.5 M.W.	349 113
Jammu	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.				
	231.51 Lac	88.68 Lac	284.16 Lac	329.04 Lac	140.13 Lac	797,000 Acres	212,000 Acres	46.5 M.W.	177 78

TABLE—II
No. of Gazetted and Non-Gazetted and Class IV officials from J & K Regions

<i>Region</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Gazetted</i>	<i>Non-Gazetted</i>	<i>Class IV</i>	<i>Total</i>
Kashmir	1961-62	224	3,164	661	4,049
Jammu	1961-62	116	1,943	519	2,578
Kashmir	1967	2,028	40,512	7,086	50,526
Jammu	1967	1,004	23,673	5,250	29,927

ting to (a) agriculture which included horticulture, animal husbandry, sheep breeding and wool development, dairying and milk supply, fisheries and forests and soil conservation, (b) power generation and (c) industries, and the excessive expenditure incurred on irrigation, education, health and what not clearly demonstrate the truth that Jammu had been denied even crumbs by the selfish Kashmiri rulers and bureaucrats. The tables showing figures prove beyond doubt that the Jammu's accusations against the partial and unjust Kashmir were legitimate and warranted and immediate solution.

Humiliating Distinctions

Even far more humiliating, unreasonable and invidious were the distinctions between the Kashmiri and non-Kashmiris in the matter of the (a) sale of foodgrains at subsidized rates, (b) quantum of foodgrains rations that were issued and (c) the location of toll barriers. The rates of foodgrains sold were "lower than what they were in Jammu. Similarly, there was "regional discrimination and bias" in the "quantum of foodgrains issued." While the quantum of monthly cereal ration in Kashmir was 11 KG of rice and 2 KG of Atta, making a total of 13 KG, in Jammu it was 3.45 KG of rice and 6.90 KG of Atta, making a total of 10.35 KG.

And the Kashmiri bosses defended their highly outrageous policies by advancing superficial, untenable and strange arguments, like (a) "the subsidized rates of foodgrains sold in Kashmir are low because the prices of foodgrains, particularly rice (in the Valley) are traditionally low" ; (b) the difference in the quantum of monthly ration in Kashmir is "on the ground that rice is less nutritious than wheat Atta"; and (c) "on account of the colder climate of Srinagar the consumption of food is higher in Srinagar than in Jammu". The arguments were, naturally, cut to their size when the Commission took the rulers to task observing that "neither of such grounds would be tenable in any other part of the country for justifying a different scale of rations in rice-eating areas or in colder climates".

That the attitude of the Kashmiri rulers was totally inimical towards Jammu was further evident from the location of the toll barriers. Till 1967 all the toll barriers were located in the Jammu region. This policy of collecting toll in respect of goods and traffic moving within the region itself had placed the economy of the Jammu region at a disadvantage. It needs to be stressed that while the toll became payable in respect of goods and traffic moving within the region of Jammu itself if they had to cross any toll barrier, no such toll was payable for movement anywhere within the Kashmir region. How did anti-Jammu and cynical politicians explained this bias ? Their stark reply was : "The toll barriers have been so located as to make the collection of the tax convenient and evasion difficult".

The recruitment policy the Kashmir leadership evolved was no better. An evaluation of the statistical data reveals that region-wise, the position of Kashmir was far better as compared with Jammu. The population of the farmer was 53 per cent but its share in the services as on April 1, 1967 was 61 per cent. Jammu, on the contrary, constituted 45 per cent of the State population but its share was just 36 per cent. The rate of recruitment of Ladakhis, too, showed a decline from a paltry 2.5 per cent in 1961-62 to 7.4 per cent in 1965-66. Further, community-wise the position of Muslims had improved whereas that of the Hindus deteriorated. The less said the better. Just one small sentence would be enough to sum up the Kashmir policy towards Jammu : the attitude of Kashmir towards Jammu was one of an active indifference.

State Autonomy

The two of the many complex and contradictory issues the Commission was confronted with were (1) Kashmiris' demand of a larger measure of autonomy for the State and (2) regional autonomy for Jammu or its separation from Kashmir. Both these ticklish issues evoked an indepth study considering their far-reaching repercussions on the unity and integrity of India as also of the State. Though intricate, the first point in question did not bother the Commission much. In fact, it dismissed the

claim outrightly adjudging it to be unjustifiable. Its opposition to the clamour was based not just on the ground that it had not been backed by any of the party from Jammu and Ladakh but also on the apprehension that the concession, if granted, would culminate in tensions in Jammu and Ladakh.

Rejecting the demand for a larger measure of autonomy, the Commission observed that "it is one of those internal matters which arise between the Union Government and constituent States and in which no third party can have a locus standi. In fact, in any federal structure, stresses and strains often occur between the federal Government and the constituent units and they have to be tackled in a democratic way by the parties concerned by evolving proper and healthy questions."

Further, the Commission emphatically asserted that the "State already enjoys a very larger measure of autonomy (under Art. 370) than the other States in the Union of India..... We do not see any justification for considering the demand for an even larger autonomy for the State in isolation without reference to the other States". Justifying the repudiation of the claim, the commission rebutted the arguments of certain Kashmiri spokesmen that the extension of the Central laws had eroded Kashmir identity or the State's autonomy. The Commission, instead, proclaimed that the Article was a temporary measure designed to achieve uniformity of the State with the rest of India in "matters of vital importance to the rights of the individual citizens and the enforcement of the rule of Law" and that the central laws had been introduced in the State in "strict compliance with the letter and spirit of that Article".

The Commission, however, overruled the suggestion that Art. 370 be abrogated on the ground that time was not yet opportune. It, instead, dismissed the demand as inadvisable and suggested that "it would be prudent to leave it to the Government and the people of the State.. themselves to decide when the Article should be abrogated".

Regional Autonomy

The issue of regional autonomy for Jammu certainly posed a serious and powerful challenge. The Commission was left with no option but to analyse the genesis of the inter-regional tensions and distrust. The nature of the demands made and political aspirations for the fulfilment of which Jammu had been struggling hard for the last about 20 years did compel the Commission admit unequivocally : "The main cause of irritation and tension was the feeling of political neglect and discrimination...from which certain regions (Jammu and Ladakh) of the State suffer...Even if all the matters were equitably settled, we feel that there would still be a measure of discontent unless the political aspirations of the different regions of the State were satisfied". The Commission even went to the extent of putting on record : "Although the Jammu and Kashmir State has been a single political entity for over hundred years, it cannot be denied that geographically, ethnically, culturally and historically, it is composed of three separate homogeneous regions, namely, Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh."

It may be pointed out that the JAF, the sole protagonist of regional autonomy for Jammu, had very "elaborately and ably" presented the Jammu case before the Commission. Narrating Jammu's dreadful and lamentable tale, the JAF had asserted that there was but one way in which conciliation could be secured and that was by granting autonomy. The chief object of the JAF, it appears, was to protect the cause and advance the interest of Jammu; to convert the growing influence of Kashmir, which had a tendency to misinterpret and degenerate Jammu or which might lead to that deplorable eventuality; and to empower Jammuites, who, for want of political power had been forced to look towards Kashmir to find scope according to their fitness and ability for public life.

There was no denying that Kashmir leadership had become a potent voice in the counsels of the State. And it was but natural and incumbent that Jammuites should do their best to

controvert and thwart that powerful influence the Kashmiri rulers had attained, when they found it working for the destruction of all that they held dear.

As a matter of fact, the JAF did a great deal to convince that the demand of autonomy (also supported by two Kashmiri leaders) had been forced upon Jammuites, as they had to protect themselves from the mischief created by the Kashmiri leaders and also to save themselves from being submerged under the rising tide of Kashmiriat.

Just at that critical juncture when the JAF was fighting a relentless and bold struggle to achieve what was certainly a limited autonomy a number of parties and individuals came out in a bitter hostility towards all that it had none and was trying to do. It would be no exaggeration if someone opines that JAMMU FAILED JAMMU. Certainly the divided Jammu and its unrealistic and half-baked leadership harmed the cause the JAF had taken in hand and armed the Commission with an avoidable opportunity of scuttling the otherwise very legitimate and much deserved demand concerning Jammu's political status.

The attitude of the Commission was even more strange and certainly contradictory. On the one hand, it would observe : "...there will still be a measure of discontent unless the political aspirations of the different regions were not satisfied", on the other, it would argue : "It is quite likely that any recognition of the autonomy of the region...may what its appetite for greater autonomy and accentuate separatist tendencies which may ultimately lead to the disintegration of the State". Even more amazing was the observation that "the acceptance of the demand of autonomy...would make an adverse impact on the minds of the residents of Kashmir". What sort of impact? Not explained.

Perhaps, the Commission had fallen a victim to the unholy and pernicious propaganda let loose by certain vested interests and elements certainly hostile to Jammu that the grant of

autonomy Jammu or its separation from Kashmir would drive Kashmir away from India or throw it in the lap of Pakistan, and to retain it Jammu had to be sacrificed and Kashmir had to be over-fed. For how else would one explain this posture of the Commission. Unambiguously, an insidious influence was at work to defeat the great object of the autonomy by an unholy alliance between Kashmiri rulers and anti-Jammu elements to which the Commission appears to have become a party.

What to talk of regional autonomy or Jammu's separation, the Commission did not even think it desirable to set up Regional Committees of the State Legislature of the sort envisaged for certain States in Art. 371 of the Union Constitution. Its reservation was based on the fact that such Committees had not worked satisfactorily and had ultimately led to the division of the State. In this connection the instance of Punjab, where such Committees had been constituted for the Punjabi-Speaking and Hindu-speaking areas of the former Punjab State and where they had failed to prevent the eventual division of the State into the new States of Punjab and Haryana, was cited. What the Commission favoured was the creation of Regional Development Boards for developmental works ignoring Jammu's strong urge for political empowerment.

Thwarting and delaying indefinitely Jammu's most cherished goal of complete integration with India and repudiating the persistent and forceful demands of the JAF and the DM, the Commission brought out its some very vague administrative scheme ostensibly to ensure equitable distribution between the regions resources available to the State Government as also to guarantee some participation of Jammu and Ladakh in the integrated development of the State. Further, to allay widespread discontent and promote good will between Jammu and to protect the former and Ladakh against exclusion by Kashmir, the Commission suggested a few modifications in the recruitment and employment policy the Kashmiri rulers had relentlessly pursued since 1947.

The Commission, it appears, had felt that the objects in view (promotion and protection of the rights of Jammu and Ladakh) might be better secured by some changes in the then existing administrative apparatus. Thus, it advocated creation of a Statutory Development Board at State level and Statutory Development Regional Boards, one each for Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh.

Development Boards

Defining the functions and jurisdictions, the Commission said that the State Board would scrutinize the regional plans, prepare a residuary plan of schemes and projects which transcend regional boundaries or happen to be of all-State dimension and allocate plan funds equitably (after taking into account the population, area and specific needs of each region) to the regional plans and the residuary plan of all-State nature. The Regional Boards were, on the other hand, empowered to draw up the regional plans; assign priority to schemes and projects included in the regional plans and supervise their implementation.

To give the State Board a somewhat comprehensive and representative outlook and to eliminate the element of inter-regional bitterness and irritation, the Commission recommended fair representation to each one of the three regions. The Regional Boards were to be presided over by the Chief Minister and to consist of legislators from the region, economists, experts and the concerned officials.

State Cabinet

The Commission sought to meet the political aspirations of Jammu by evolving a compromise regarding sharing of political power which Jammu would be able to accept and Kashmir would hesitate to reject. After examining the character and composition of the State Cabinet and Jammu's response and reaction to it, it laid down a few conventions aiming at giving a sense of belonging and parity to Jammu

with Kashmir. It suggested; "If the Chief Minister belong to one region, there would be Deputy Chief Minister belonging to the other region. By another convention, the number of Cabinet Ministers belonging to the two regions (Jammu and Kashmir) should be equal. There should also be a full-fledged Cabinet Minister belonging to Ladakh".

Other Suggestions

Other suggestions of the Commission included (a) division of the functions of each Head of Department on a regional basis; (b) creation of Regional Recruitment Boards and District Recruitment Boards; (c) establishment of a full-fledged University for the Jammu region; (d) opening of a separate medical college at Jammu; (e) introduction of uniform prices of foodgrains throughout the State; (f) uniformity in the quantum of foodgrain rations issued; (g) re-examination and rationalisation of the system of collection of toll and location of toll barriers; (h) setting up of a Degree College for Ladakh; (i) stable and satisfactory arrangements for providing electricity to Leh and Kargil; (j) revival of the single-line administration in its entirety in Ladakh; (k) merger of the post of Development Commissioner with that of the Deputy Commissioner so that the incumbent could function as the Head of all the departments in Ladakh, etc. etc.

Less Novel

Liberal and casual politicians of Jammu have at times been ecstatic about the Gajendragadkar proposals as positive proof of basic good intentions. They see in the reform scheme a clear break with the old line of anti-Jammu Kashmir administration. It may be pointed out that the Gajendragadkar Report on the whole has enjoyed a much better press and response, thanks in large part to the undue importance the JS, the BJP, the Panthers Party and the Jammu Mahasabha (JMS) attach to it.

A closer look at the reform process, however, reveals it to have been considerably less novel or far reaching as it kept

the central authority safely with Kashmir with, of course, a few crumbs to Jammu and Ladakh. The core of the Report was that the centre of political gravity must not pass from Kashmir's long hands. The reforms were, undoubtedly, paltry and illusory and can be dismissed as a meaningless sham for they do not represent the will of Jammu and in no way recognise its right to shape and control fully its political and economic future. Instead, Boards termed as Development Boards which provided for some development, but not equal participation of Jammu and Ladakh were recommended.

Kashmir Response

What did the Kashmiri rulers including their few henchmen in Jammu do with the unsatisfactory Report? Did they accept it and implement the proposed petty concessions? The straight answer is, No. The proposals failed to carry conviction with the then Congress cynical and wily politicians whose chief aim it was to perpetuate Kashmiri domination and exploitation of the people of Jammu and Ladakh. Even the progressive G.M. Sadiq failed in providing justice and fair play to Jammu. Had he accepted the Report and implemented the recommendations, at least Development Boards for Jammu and Ladakh would have been achieved. And the pressure of such Boards on the State Cabinet would doubtless have operated strongly in the direction of inducing it to aim at political empowerment of Jammu and Ladakh.

Mir Qasim, Sheik Abdullah, Dr. Abdullah and G.M. Shah, who ruled the State between 1971 and January 1990, did not take any initiative to ameliorate Jammu's lot. Rather under them, the problems facing Jammu and Ladakh worsened. The high hopes of all those who had been looking forward to Kashmir's benevolence or those who had expected the Kashmiri rulers to order something of the blessings they would confer on Jammu and Ladakh as the two important regions of the State, thus remained unrealised. Whatever be the extent of its inadequacy, the Gajendragadkar Report of 1968 had certainly fascinated a section of the people of Jammu. This

section appears to have perceived that under a Regional Development Board, Jammu could rise to a position of power and affluence unattainable in the existing administrative set-up. But the unrealistic Kashmir policy which had already appealed to and excited powerful appetites and individual hopes of the Kashmiri leaders had transformed them and they as a consequence had turned arrogant and haughty. Not surprisingly, the Kashmiri rulers dismissed with ease and summerily each and every scheme aimed at some empowerment of Jammu and Ladakh.

Present Scenario

No wonder, from different quarters, the demand for statehood or autonomy is getting vociferous and clearer with each passing day. It would indeed be a folly to interpret the clamours as something preposterous and silly. The demands, in fact, are the manifestations of the growing discontent, unrest, neglect and anger. It is obvious that an agitation is on foot which may in certain events lead to the most serious consequences. The mood of the people in Jammu and Ladakh embittered by regional hostility and discrimination and suffering from a deep sense of frustration as the doors of services and other avenues are slammed against them, together with ill-started measures, is one of bitter resentment and symptoms forebade a revolutionary revolt.

Solution

A solution to the problems afflicting Jammu and Ladakh, and for that matter Kashmir, lies in meeting their legitimate political aspirations by evolving some realistic political formula acceptable to the people and not in associating Dr. Farooq who has become a marginal figure, aggravating the problem to exploit it, and who on February 6, 1991 said at New Delhi in a 100-minute luncheon chat (mostly on record) with Delhi-Based foreign correspondents: "I directed my partymen to lie low, go across the border, get training in arms handling, do anything but do not get caught by Mr. Jagmohan

(the State Government between January 1990 and May 1990)... If Kashmir was to remain a part of India, not only the State's special status will have to be kept unharmed but the eroded features of the State's autonomy will have to be restored (restoration of pre-1953 set up)...The people of the State (Kashmir) were afraid that Kashmiriat will be eroded if they remained with India...I betrayed my people for I could not deliver what I had promised" (*Times of India*, Feb. 7, 1991).

The best formula is not the suppression of the inherent politico-economic rights of Jammu and Ladakh but the trifurcation of the State and holding of free and fair elections in the Valley so that the Kashmiris could secure the appointment of representatives of the class by whom they wanted themselves to be represented. So far the Valley rulers and the Central leaders have only stopgap arrangements whenever any problem or tension arose. The clamour by Jammu for absolute political power and Kashmir's desire for a truly representative legislature is sought to be mollified by such ad-hoc devices at the appointment of the Gajendragadkar Commission, the Sikri Commission, the Wazir Commission and the Delimitation Commission whose reports are yet to be implemented, and the 1952 Delhi Agreement, 1975 Indira-Sheikh Accord and the 1987 Rajiv-Farooq Accord, all aimed at pampering the Sheikh or his family. Even under the present New Delhi dispensation the same dangerous theory is persisting-nourish Kashmir at the cost of Jammu and Ladakh, pamper and conciliate Dr. Farooq and give him wide powers so that he could misrule and plunder and cripple Jammu and Ladakh.

It is time that Prime Minister Chandra Shekhar and the State Government, Girish Chandra Saxena, realise the gravity of the situation and think hard and quick about the logic behind the clamours for statehood, autonomy, Regional Council and Union Territory status. What is needed today is an objective approach. The failure on their part to look the facts in the face would prove highly dangerous and would surely culminate in a powerful movement unleashed by Jammu

and Ladakh to obtain a new political order of their liking. The spirit of the Indian Constitution is a different thing and it cannot be avoided. Cast-iron bureaucracy cannot go on for ever. Everyone is warning New Delhi and the State Raj Bhawan of the growth of new spirit in Jammu and Ladakh. Thupstan Chewang (LBA), Prof Chaman Lal (BJP), Gulchain Singh Charak (JMS), M.M. Khajuria (JPE), Dr. Virender (JMM), Bhim Singh (the Panthers Party), Rachhpal Singh (the Jammu Praja Parishad), Ashok Gupta (Shiv Sena) and Balraj Puri (champion of Jammu autonomy), all sing the same song-you cannot go on governing in the same spirit. ('Jammu Imbrolio, *Daily Excelssior*, January 10-16, 1991),

The Plot

There are cogent reasons for the people of Jammu to be extremely perturbed over the highly abominable, insulting and humiliating manner in which census operations have been stalled in Jammu and Kashmir and these need to be put in a perspective. The need has become all the more exigent in the light of the just concluded census operations throughout the country, including Punjab and Assam gripped by separatist sentiments.

Notwithstanding Governor Girish Chandra Saxena's silence over the exclusion of the State from the very important gambut, there are umpteen "reports" to suggest that the much needed process has been abandoned at the insistence of the "Kashmiri vested interests", including the NC—Congress (I) nexus and the former Union Home Minister and a Janta Dal leader, Mufti Mohammad Syed. There are clear indications that the Kashmiri nexus has beguiled the Registrar General of India to make Jammu acquiesce the Kashmir's will.

The reason advanced by the nexus that "in the present atmosphere created by the militants, census operations were" impossible is as untenable as it is fallacious. Had the secessionist militancy been the chief determinant, the Registrar General would not have ordered census exercise in Punjab "convulsed by the most lethal terrorism in the world". "Lebnon, northern Ireland, and Israel-occupied West Bank", says *the Times*

of India, "are considered hot trouble-spots. But violence kills far more people in Punjab than in these three places combined. In Lebanon, for instance, 1,150 people died of political violence in 1989. IRA terrorism accounted for 93 deaths in northern Ireland in 1988. And less than 1,000 people have died in three years of the *intifada* in the West Bank.....However, the death toll in Punjab due to terrorism-related violence was 3,874 last year-roughly about ten deaths per day. But more alarming is the fact that killings in Punjab are doubling every year. There were 63 deaths in 1985, 520 in 1986, 910 in 1987, 1,872 in 1987, and 3,774 in 1990." And in this regard, Punjab's former police chief, Julio Rebeiro, and Punjab's present Director General of Police, D.S. Mangal are on record having admitted that terrorist violence is on the rise.

As against this bloodied Punjab scenario, Jammu and Kashmir presents a somewhat different picture, notwithstanding the wholesale migration of the Kashmiri Pandits. Violence liquidates far less people in Kashmir than in Punjab where, according to Government figures, 10,540 people have died in terrorist-related violence in the last ten years. Such deaths in Kashmir, when totalled up, work out to an outside maximum of 1,000 roughly two deaths per day. That the situation in the Valley is not that serious as it is in Punjab is further evident from the Governor's repeated assertions: "Today we are in a much better position than we were a year ago. There is perceptible change in the mood of people and in the thinking of the militants...."

The fact of the matter is that it is not secessionist violence but the political conspiracy against Jammu hatched by the Kashmiri leadership which has influenced the Registrar General of India in delinking Jammu and Kashmir from the census operations. And the present administration can be legitimately accused of aiding, may be inadvertently, the vested interests in their diabolical plot against Jammu seething with around discontent.

Those who concernedly express fear about the resultant

danger to the very existence of Jammu created by New Delhi-Srinagar combine might recall that its doom all started with Jawaharlal Nehru's flippancy in the endorsement of the totally unrealistic political set-up consisting of disparate elements in the State with dubious Kashmir leadership fully empowered to dictate terms to Jammu, to exploit its manual and economic resources, to force it to adopt a policy of political mendicancy and to reduce it to a mere nullity. Jammu encountered the second Kashmir-sponsored blitz when in 1951 the State was kept aloof from the census operations conducted that year in the country. (The first onslaught being the out-of-proportion importance to Sheikh Abdullah in the matter of the State's accession to the Indian Dominion on October 26, 1947, which only whetted his appetite to ask for more and establish a Switzerland type independent Kashmir.) The immediate fallout of the outrageous action was the delimitation of the constituencies for the State Legislative Assembly based on the 1941 census. This was done despite the fact the complexion of the State population had undergone a sea-change owing to the migration of over one lakh Muslims to Pakistan and influx of over two lakh refugees from the Pakistan Occupied Kashmir (POK) as also the migration of many Hindus and Sikhs from the Valley of Kashmir to Jammu region.

This unfair and tendentious exercise based on the 1941 figures gave 30 seats to Jammu, 43 to Kashmir and a paltry 2 to Ladakh region in a house of 100. The remaining 25 seats in the Assembly were kept reserved for the POK. The matter, however, did not end here. To further deprive Jammu of true and genuine representation in the Legislative Assembly, which was later converted into a Constituent Assembly for the purpose of framing a separate constitution of the State, the Sheikh's dispensation rejected nomination papers of almost all candidates of the Praja Parishad, the only opposition party in the State which subsequently merged with Bhartiya Jana Sangh (BJS). This undemocratic and unethical machination obviously left the Praja Parishad with no option but to boycott the

elections resulting in no-election at all. The result was that the entire 75-member Assembly was packed with members of one party the National Conference.

Jammu did cry for justice and fairplay. But the enemies of Jammu preferred to be the Sheikh's stooges. Proximity to possible loaves and fishes of power and patronage encouraged a trend towards co-operation with the anti-Jammu Sheikh. The self-seekers and rank opportunists took the plunge, accepting ministerial and other posts. The lust for power and pelf obliged them to play to the tunes of the Sheikh and to scuttal the well-conceieved and well-meaning moves of the Praja Parishad, the champion of the Jammu's cause.

Representation

In 1961, however, Jammu got an opportunity to convince the powers that be of its claim to due representation in the Assembly based on population, area and nature of terrain, accessibility and geographical conditions, the three critarions the Representation of People's Act envisages for the delimitation of the assembly constituencies. The opportunity was provided by the census of that year conducted in Jammu and Kashmir alongwith the rest of the country.

It needs to be mentioned that as per the 1961 census Jammu's population was 16 lakh and that of Kashmir 18 lakh. But Kashmiri leadership contrived to retain twelve seats more that of Jammu which obviously means that the 2 lakh Kashmiris were qualified to return twelve legislators at the rate of one per 16,666 persons. The hoodwinked Jammu, on the other hand, was entitled to elect 30 legislators at the rate of one per 53,333 persons. This excessive and unfairly preponderant share of given to the Kashmiris as also the unjust, invidious and humiliating distinctions made between the former and the non-Kashmiris was enough to exasperate the BJ which launched a "struggle" demanding that the position of the Jammuites in the structure of representative government should commensurate with their numerical strength. But nothing came out of it. The

divided and wavering Jammu failed in putting up a united front to counter the sinister design). The Delimitation Commission, on its part, did try to conciliate Jammu when in 1966 it offered ONE seat in the form of a crumb. What a favour ! What a Jammu leadership !

The decade 1961-71 saw Jammu facing yet another blitz. And this was the denial of due representation in the Lok Sabha. The crafty and calculating politicians that the Kashmiris were, they manipulated in favour of Kashmir three seats at the rate of one per 6 lakh population. The enthralled and beguiled Jammu got just two seats at the rate one per 8 lakh. The plight of Jammu has remained unchanged since 1967 when for the first time direct elections to the Lok Sabha were held.

Divided Jammu continued crying loudly for fair-and-square treatment during the next decade too. The census of 1971, which had put the Jammu's population at 21 lakh and of Kashmir 23, did not bring any relief to the former. However, when Jammu reacted the Kashmiri leadership acted to cool down passions. Jammu which had been put on the market for sale by self-seekers and rank-opportunists was purchased in 1975 by Kashmir in lieu of ONE seat. The fully controlled Delimitation Commission refused to take cognizance of the criteria fixed by the Representation of People's Act. Instead, it negated and perverted the logic and permitted Kashmir to return 43 legislators at the rate of one per 53,488 persons. Jammu, on the other hand, was dismissed as something irrelevant in the State politics and was forced to elect legislators at the rate of one per 67,741 persons. Similarly, Kashmir had the proud privilege of returning members to the Lok Sabha at the rate of one per 7,66,666 persons, whereas Jammu had the option of electing members at the rate of one per 10,50,000 persons.

Situation did not change even after 1981. As per the 1981 census the Jammu's population was 26,91,621 and that of the Valley 31,30,090. But during the decade 1981-91, no delimitation of the constituencies was undertaken even though a Commission was appointed over seven years ago for the pur-

pose. Under the circumstances, Jammu could not but countenance the Kashmir's hegemony. It suffered and continued returning 32 legislators and 2 members of the Lok Sabha at the rate of one per 84,113 and 13,45,810 persons, respectively, whereas Kashmir went on humbling and ruining the former with the full backing of New Delhi and continued electing legislators and members of parliament at the rate of one per 72,000 and 10,43,363 persons, respectively.

Stimulus

However, during the period one significant political development took place and that was the National Conference-Congress (I) sponsored amendment to the State's Constitution which raised the strength of the Assembly from 76 to 87 members. This development provided an additional stimulus to the continuing controversy over the number of assembly and Lok Sabha seats Jammu deserve. The BJP took the lead immediately after the amendment was adopted. Laying stress on the population-ratio, area and the nature of terrain, it demanded and continues to demand 41 and 4 assembly seats for Jammu and Ladakh, respectively. In addition, it is persistently pursuing the authorities to hold census at the earliest pointing out that "activities of the militants are confined to just four out of the fourteen districts of the State" and that "the abandoning of census" is conveying an "impression" that the whole State is on the boil. However, the success of the efforts is nowhere in sight—thanks to the opposition of the Kashmiri vested interests and the confused Jammu leadership.

Opposition

The opposition by the Kashmiri leaders to the census at this stage is quite meaningful. Over two lakh persons have migrated from the Valley owing to the situation created by the secessionist militancy. If at this stage the census is held, it would certainly affect the future of the Valley vis-a-vis Jammu. It is this fear which have unnerved and alarmed the Delhi-based Kashmiri leaders.

It needs to be emphasised that Farooq Abdullah, the Jamat-e-Islami and other fundamentalists in the Valley had challenged more than once "the very figures of the census of the past years with their nefarious designs to exploit the Muslim sentiments in Kashmir as also elsewhere in the Islamic World". In support of their claim they had been quoting census figures to argue that the percentage increase in the population in Jammu has been higher than that of the Kashmir Valley.

Responsibility

But then, who is responsible for this increase? The simple and straight answer is : fundamentalists' misdeeds. The increase is undoubtedly the result of gradual migration of minorities from Kashmir to Jammu. This is evident from many a colony that the Kashmir Pandits have developed during the last two decades in and around Jammu. The incidence of migration received a further impetus when in 1986 the Pandits became the targets of the communal frenzy let loose by the fundamentalists and pro-Pakistan clout.

Yet another factor which contributed significantly to the increase in Jammu's population was the large scale infiltration of Muslims from POK in the Poonch-Rajouri areas. The infiltration registered a substantial increase particularly after Sheikh Abdullah was catapulted back to power in 1975 under the Indira-Sheikh Accord.

It may sound strange and unbelievable but it is a hard fact that the rate of increase in population between 1971 and 1981 in other districts was less than 29 per cent, whereas it was 37.47 per cent in Rajouri district although during 1961-71 this increase was 26.73 per cent. Similarly, in Poonch district the increase was 30.27 per cent between 1971 and 81, while it was a paltry 10.52 per cent during 1961-71.

It should also be noted that as per the 1971 census, the increase in Jammu's population between 1961 and 71 was 31.98 per cent, whereas in the Kashmir Valley it was 29.23 per cent.

Likewise, during 1971-81, the increase in the Jammu region had been 30.92 per cent, whereas in the Kashmir Valley, it was 29.42 per cent.

Complaint

The complaint of the people of Jammu that they are continuously neglected and humbled by the powers that be in New Delhi or Srinagar, regardless of the which party acted as a decision-maker, is indeed choranic. They have been suffering from their depredations. They appear fed up with the political outfits operating in Jammu, which are corrupt and irresponsible to the core. They have known the bitterness of the President's Rule too which, they assert, is no panacea. Today, Jammu's psyche stands hurt and badly battered and tortured. Senseless postponement of census operations and elections to the Lok Sabha has, undoubtedly, betrayed their trust in the President's dispensation.

There is growing realisation that the power-wielders would not grant them democratic rights and justice unless and until they are forced to do so. Postponement of census operations and elections on the sole ground that Kashmir is on the boil has unambiguously been interpreted by the people of Jammu as a banishment of democracy from Jammu and Ladakh for ever. This growing despondency is visible everywhere and it certainly portends the rise of a very powerful movement for a separate Jammu State.

Need

In fact, the denial of due representation in the State political apparatus, the denial of due representation in the State Legislature and the Lok Sabha, subversion of census operations and election process are the stark realities which the people must evaluate forthwith. If, in the process they come to the conclusion which they would that the policies openly followed by the authorities are not conducive to the preservation and promotion of their self-respect and political psyche, they must

gether together under one banner and strike for a separate Jammu State, which is the only panacea available. The sooner it is done, the better.

The question before the people of Jammu is now no more whether they should obtain 41 assembly seats or 2 Lok Sabha seats. The question is how Jammu's political psyche and importance should be defended against the onslaughts of the Kashmiri leadership supported by the Congress (I)-NC leaders of Jammu as also by the President's dispensation. The responsibility to promote Jammu's cause lies solely with them. They must rise to the occasion. It is still not too late. ('Census : Plot Against Jammu,' *Daily Excelsior*, Jammu).

BJP-LBA Unity

The September 1, 1990, Bhartiya Janta Party (BJP) political conference at Jammu will prove a turning point in the history of political relations between Jammu and Ladakh on the one hand and between them and the valley of Kashmir on the other. What made the event of a far reaching consequences historic and memorable was the participation in the proceedings of the conference of the activists of the Ladakhi Buddhists Association (LBA) in the same number and with the same enthusiasm as the people of Jammu did. Even more significant was the unstinted and unqualified support extended to the cause of Jammu and Ladakh by the Kashmiri Pandits who are demanding creation of a security zone for themselves in the valley believing that their political aspirations are identical with those of Jammuites and Ladakhis and their cultural identity similar to that of Kashmir Muslims.

In fact, Jammu and Ladakh and the forces rabidly opposed to the Kashmiri domination over the State's politics and economy and the centre's policy of pampering the muslim leadership of the valley without any regard to the legitimate politico-economic interests and aspirations of non-Kashmiris witnessed a remarkable unity promising a bright future to those living in the rather neglected regions.

On that eventful day, both the BJP and the LBA urged Jammuites and Ladakhis (1) to launch a joint struggle against the discriminatory and communal policies of the State and central governments controlled by Kashmiri bureaucrats and local and central leaders who take the docility of the oppressed and suppressed Jammuites and Ladakhis for granted and (2) to pressurise the Central government to evolve a two pronged strategy with a view to removing the existing imbalances and laying down a statutory system in which no region can dominate the other in any sphere of life in future.

The epoch-making appeal was made from the platform of the state-level BJP convention addressed by the top-ranking leaders of the party and the LBA. The prominent among those who graced the historic occasion were none other than Atal Behari Bajpai, leader of the BJP Parliamentary Party in the Rajya Sabha and the former party president, Kidar Nath Sahni, the All-India General Secretary of the party and the one who is an expert in the Jammu and Kashmir affairs, and the radical, energetic and volatile Thupstan Chewang, the LBA chief.

Making a passionate plea for Jammu-Ladakh Unity for the redressal of their long-standing genuine politico-economic grievances and to compel the central government to get a patient and sympathetic consideration of their rational hopes and just political aspirations, the LBA Chief said: "For the last 43 years, the people of Jammu and Ladakh have been denied their inherent constitutional rights. We have been struggling for justice but separately. Let us unite, for our sufferings are common." Reflecting on this passionate appeal of Chewang, Kidar Nath Sahni declared in unequivocal terms his party's full support to the cause of Jammu and Ladakh. He forcefully told the enthusiastic audience that, "...let this day (September 1) the people of Jammu and Ladakh decide that they will not tolerate injustice anymore. Together they can shake the government...This will be the beginning of a new chapter in the history of the State."

Though the stress of the speakers including Bajpai was on the necessity of evolving a scheme to satisfy the politico-economic aspirations of Jammuites and Ladakhis, they also made it loud and clear that "any settlement of the Kashmir problem which did not take care of the interests of Jammuites and Ladakhis, as also the Kashmiri migrants and the nomadic tribes of Gujjars and Bakarwals would not be acceptable." In other words, the BJP-LBA-Kashmiri pandits leadership warned the central government in unambiguous terms that no scheme of reform would meet the real requirements of the time if it does not take into confidence Jammuites, Ladakhis and Kashmiri Pandits, who under the existing conditions do not have any inducement and opportunity to play any significant role in the state affairs.

All the leaders who participated in the one day BJP convention sang the same song and impressed upon the Central government the necessity of formulating a pragmatic scheme to curb militancy in Kashmir, on the one hand, and to satisfy the aspirations of Jammu, Ladakh and Kashmiri Pandits, on the other.

The resolution on gross-discrimination against Jammu and Ladakh passed, the emotional and volatile speeches the BJP-LBA leaders made and the historic decisions they took with the activists of both the parties and the Kashmiri Pandits associations extending their whole-hearted support to the programme that is to be formulated to achieve the objectives for which the conventions was organised not only reflect the remarkable and historic unity based on principle among those oppressed and frustrated by the Kashmiri misrule, but also point to the turbulent situation towards which the state is heading in the near future.

What has after all brought the state to such a critical pass? The answer lies in the October 1947 Delhi decision to let the three regions of Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh to be ruled from Srinagar alone. The 1947 Delhi decision was, un-

doubtedly, politically unwise, culturally unwanted, ethnically undesirable, linguistically irrational, geographically unnatural and economically ruinous. Had the central government taken into consideration the pre-1947 political and socio-cultural developments in the state, particularly those between October 1924 and 1947, the decision would have been certainly different, rational, lasting and scientific and now it would not have to reap the fruits of the seed it sowed in 1947.

It needs to be emphasised that the sordid story of the sacrifice of Jammu and Ladakh's constitutional and economic rights began with the dawn of the Indian independence and the accession of the Jammu and Kashmir State to the Indian Union on October 26, 1947." "The misguided zeal of the Central government, not caring for the sentiments of the patriotic and loyal people of Jammu" and Ladakh, "played to the tune of Kashmiri leaders by declaring accession as partial and subject to ratification by the people of Kashmir." This blunder of the central government has made the people of Jammu Ladakh a hostage to the inconstant and fickle sentiments of the leadership of the Kashmir valley.

That the Union of Jammu and Ladakh with Kashmir is an unnatural wedlock is evident from the fact that each one of these regions has its own distinct identity and personality. Maharaja Gulab Singh's acquisition of Kashmir in March 1846 under the Treaty of Amritsar created a hybrid political entity without any emotional cultural and geographical blending of disparate elements. However, it may be pointed out that the integration between Jammu and Kashmir was merely political and was primarily necessitated by the British Indian government desire to have a buffer between the expanding Russian empire and their Indian dominion. As a result of the imperialist conspiracies the focus of State ruler attention shifted to Kashmir and the northern frontier of India including Ladakh, Gilgit, Hunza Nagar, Yasin, Chittral, Iskoman, etc. It needs to be highlighted that Jammu made supreme sacrifices to expand the northern frontiers of India and maintained them. It may also be emphasised that contribution of Kashmir

to this enterprise was absolutely nil.

After the independence of India once again the centre of power in the State shifted to Kashmir which comprises only 1/9 of the total area of the State and nearly half of its population. Jammu and Ladakh were neglected to the position of poor relatives and the people of Jammu and Ladakh, led by the exhortations of national leaders sacrificed their legitimate politico-administrative and economic interests and rights on the altar of what was pronounced as the national cause of bringing the Kashmiris to the national mainstream.

The recent developments in Kashmir and the ongoing Kashmiris' fight for 'Azadi' have amply demonstrated that the supreme sacrifices made by the People of Jammu and Ladakh have been fruitless. They have not contributed in any way to curbing the fissiparous tendencies in Kashmir nor have they been able to function as a bridge between Kashmir and the rest of India. On the other hand, it seems that the unnatural wedlock of Jammu and Ladakh with Kashmir has provided opportunities to the communal and fundamentalist elements in Kashmir to feed suspicion between the regions and thus nourish communalism and disaffection. The alienation of the people of Jammu and Ladakh from the Kashmiri rulers has led to the alienation of Kashmir from the rest of India. The politicians of Kashmir and Delhi have also never failed to exploit these fissiparous tendencies when it suited their interests and predilections.

That the situation in the entire state has assumed alarming proportions and that with each passing day the situation is further deteriorating is evident from the resolution on discrimination against Jammu and Ladakh passed on September 1, 1990. This Resolution reads: "Obviously, the integrity of State is in peril. The people of Jammu have suffered all the indignities of 2nd class citizen treatment on the twin plea that their suffering are a part of their role for bringing the people of the valley in the national mainstream and ensuring the

integrity of the state. The scale and intensity of the unprecedented secessionist violence going on in the valley and public support thereto shows that our sacrifices have gone down the drain. Far from joining the mainstream there is a demand in the valley for secession of the State. This knocks the bottom out of the rationale for expecting Jammu to be a mute sufferer for the national cause of strengthening the mainstream politics in Kashmir. In such a situation, the question that engages the mind of Jammuites at large is whether there is any wisdom or gain in continuing to suffer purpose-lessly at the hands of Kashmir dominated regimes in future any more."

The misereable plight of Jammuites and Ladakhis reminds one of the debate in the British House of Commons on the Indian Councils Bills of 1892. When the Indian Councils Bill was being read for the second time in the House of Commons, an amendment was moved by C.E. Schewann, a member of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, that "no reform of the Indian Councils which does not embody the elective principle will prove satisfactory to the Indian people, or compatible with the good government of India." G.N. Curzon, who later became the Governor-General of India and, who, at that time, was under Secretary of State for India, condemning C.E. Schwann said that "the amendment was vitiated by a two-fold fallacy, for while Schwann, affected to speak on behalf of the Indian people, he at the same time entirely ignored the primary conditions of Indian life. For who were the people of India? The people of India are the voiceless millions who are perhaps universally unaware of the fact that the English are in their country as rulers. The people of India are the ryots and the peasants, whose life is not one of political aspirations but of mute penury and toils." In other words, Lord Curzon poured contempt on Indians and declared that India was unfit for self-governing institutions. As a result Schwann failed to muster the required support in the House of Commons in favour of the amendment he had moved. The official bill was passed as the Indian Councils Act of 1892 which in no way

came up to the expectations of the Indians. The condition of the Indians remained as miserable as it was in the pre-1892 British rule.

And, today if some one says that the plight of Jammuites and Ladakhis is identical with that of the pre-1947 Indians would not at all be surprising. Jammuites and Ladakhis would certainly be within their rights if they venture to say that in 1947 India achieved political redemption, whereas Jammu and Ladakh became slaves of Kashmir.

The existing political set-up in the state is being criticised on several grounds: Firstly, for the excessive and unfairly preponderant share of representation given to the Kashmiris; secondly, for the unjust, invidious and humiliating distinctions made between Kashmiri and non-Kashmiri subjects of the State in the matter of employment, political power and economic development; thirdly, for the wide, arbitrary and unreasonable restrictions for candidates hailing from Jammu and Ladakh seeking admission to the professional and technical institutions in the Kashmir valley and seeking employment under the State government; fourthly, for the general distrust of Jammuites and Ladakhis that runs through the whole course of the administrative, political and economic policies and lastly, for the unsatisfactory composition of the State legislature rendering it ineffective and unreal for all practical purposes so far as Jammu and Ladakh are concerned.

Then the people of Jammu and Ladakh complain of the centre's policy of pampering the Kashmiri leadership which has forced Jammuites and Ladakhis to adopt a policy of political mendicancy. The 1952 Delhi Agreement, the 1975 Indira-Sheikh Accord and the 1987 Rajiv-Farooq Accord clearly prove this point. All these agreements were made to strike a deal with the Kashmiri leadership over the heads of the people of Jammu and Ladakh.

But then, what is the result? The result is before every one. While Kashmir is burning, Jammu and Ladakh are

simmering and seething and sitting on the crater of volcano. The frustration of the people on account of the failure to realise their distinct personality has reached a stage where any spark may lead to an explosion that will make the disturbances in Panjab, Assam and Kashmir pale into insignificance.

On the one hand, Kashmir is fighting a determined battle to achieve political emancipation from India, on the other, Jammu and Ladakh are demanding full integration with India by reposing their confidence in the Indian constitution leaving the valley all alone to decide its political future. While the stress of Ladakhis is on securing a Union Territory Status for Ladakh, the people of Jammu are entertaining all sorts of radical options. "A strong under-current to get rid of the domination of Kashmir region is capturing the imagination of the people of Jammu. The desire for a separate Jammu state is gaining momentum."

Thus the cumulative effect of the political neglect and discrimination against Jammu and Ladakh; the ongoing upsurge in Kashmir for Azadi and the Centre's policy of appeasing the Kashmiri leadership is the growing discontent, dissatisfaction and anger against the central and state governments. The political perception of the people of Jammu and Ladakh is undergoing a radical change. A number of regional parties such as the Panthers Party, the Jammu Mahasabha, the Jammu People Front, Jammu Mukti Morcha, The Jammu Praja Parishad and the LBA have emerged to protect and promote the regional aspirations. Sensing erosion of their support base and the substantial support the regional parties are getting, the national parties, including the BJP have started supporting and further arousing regional sentiments.

The resolution passed on September 1 at Jammu clearly reflects a sea-change in the BJP political perception. The change is all the more significant for the party has always stood for the unity and integrity of the State and opposed each and every move aimed at its vivisection.

Explaining the circumstances responsible for such a revolutionary change in the BJP attitude, the resolution said: "From the day one, the Sheikh (Sheikh Mohd. Abdullah) came to power, he gave practical shape to his anti-Jammu urges in all fields of administration. A process of deliberate neglect and discrimination against Jammu and Ladakh was initiated, which has been pursued vigorously by nearly all the Kashmiri dominated Governments to date. The result is a preponderance of glaring imbalances in all the spheres in Jammu and Ladakh... The people of Jammu have all along been feeling the pinch of discrimination and expressing their resentment from time to time. Despite their continuous efforts; the position has gone from bad to worse. The response of the State Governments to the cries of Jammu has been a mere eye-wash. Recommendations of various bodies like the Gajendragadkar Commission, the Sikri Commission and the Wazir Commission set-up to probe the matter and suggest remedial measures have been totally ignored. The result is a flood of resentment and frustration all over the region."

Admitting that the desire for a separate Jammu State is gaining momentum, the resolution still expressed the opinion that "Those who feel that all is not yet lost and there is still scope for retrieving the situation should pay urgent and serious attention to the ills of discrimination against Jammu and Ladakh regions."

The resolution strongly urged the State and Central Governments to formulate a two pronged strategy to tackle the task of removing regional imbalances and to make the people feel that "they can live in honour and prosper unhindered in Jammu and Kashmir State as Indians without suffering any social, political, economic and developmental discrimination". The two pronged strategy that the political conference suggested included the following proposals :—

- (i) to take steps for removing the existing imbalances and
- (ii) to lay down a statutory system in which no region can dominate the other in any sphere of life in future.

As regards steps for removing the existing imbalances, the political conference demanded that (a) Jammu be given its due share of 41 assembly seats and Ladakh region 4 in the enhanced assembly of 87 seats; (b) three new districts of Reasi, Kishtwar and Samba as recommended by the, Wazir Commission be constituted forthwith; (c) orders to establish engineering, dental, pharmacy, agriculture, veterinary, forestry and ayurvedic colleges in Jammu be issued immediately, (d) orders for shifting of headquarters to Jammu of all the State Corporations be issued immediately till normalcy is restored in the Valley. When the Valley is normal, this distribution be done on 50% ;50% basis; (e) prompt action be taken to ensure that the posts of Secretary-cum-Commissioners in the Secretariat and heads of departments at the State level and Chairmen and Managing Directors of State Corporations are held by officers from each division according to population ratio. All regional Heads of Department should belong to the region concerned. Further regionalisation of cadres of the other government employees be done and posts in particular region be held by the employees of that region; (f) admissions to professional colleges like medical, engineering and agriculture etc. be restricted to the students and residents of the particular region and (g) to make up for the denial of due share to Jammu in the allotment of funds in the past special funds to the tune of Rs. 1,000 crores be allocated to Jammu for another bridge over the river Tawi, promotion of tourism, new hydel projects, completion of medical college, up-grading of Gandhi Nagar Hospital to the level of SMGS Hospital, Jammu, and completion of Jammu University complex.

As regards statutory system in which no region can dominate the other in future; the BJP political conference asked for a measure providing for an institutional framework to eliminate the possibility of recurrence of discrimination imbalances in future. In other words, the conference demanded statutory regional councils of democratic and political character to take care of the entire gamut of governmental activity and to meet the power-sharing political aspirations of the people of Jammu and Ladakh.

The conference, in addition, warned the Central Government that the only option left before it is the prompt and earnest implementation of the suggestions referred to above. The implementation to the of said suggestions is, the conference as serten, "perhaps the last chance to dispel the gathering storm threatening the integrity of the State . . . It is imperative that the wave of regional resentment sweeping across Jammu and Ladakh be rolled back before it is too late."

On September 2, Atal Behari Bajpai explaining the demands of the political conference supported the LBA's demand for a Union Territory Status for the cold desert Ladakh region, but dis-favoured the idea of statehood to Jammu for the timd being. Speaking at a press conference at Jammu, Bajpai cited variovs constitutional difficulties in the creation of a separate Jammu State. In support of his theory, Bajpai said that while the grant of a Union Territory Status to Ladakh will not affect much the present composition of the State assembly, the grant of statehood to Jammu would. However he admitted that grant of a Union Territory Status to Ladakh would certainly give air to the demand of statehood to the Jammu region.

Bajpai, however, stressed the need of creating separate statutory boards for the development and redressal of public grievances in Jammu and Ladakh. It appears that Bajpai has been prompted to voice such a demand by the Janta Dal Government's decision to set up separate development boards under Art. 371 of the Indian Constitution for the regions of Konkan, Vidarbha and Marathwada in Maharashtra.

Though important and significant, the BJP resolution, embodying various proposals for Jammu and Ladakh, and Bajpai's formula would not solve the major problems facing Jammuites and Ladakhis. The chief drawback from which the resolution and Bajpai's formula suffer is their inability to fulfill the political aspirations of the people of Jammu. While a Union Territory status to Ladakh can certainly meet the requirements of Ladakhis, statutory regional council or Art. 371 will fail to protect and promote the political aspira-

tions of Jammuites.

Take, for instance, Art 371 of the Indian Constitution which provides that the President of India may by order vest any special responsibility in the office of the Governor for the establishment of development boards. The equitable allocation of funds for development expenditure over the areas also the responsibility of the Governor. It must, however, be noted that Art. 371 (2) is full of ambiguities. In the words of Nani A. Palkhivala, a noted jurist, "There is no Article in the (Indian) Constitution more vague and unsatisfactory than Art. 371. It is fraught with such formidable ambiguities that thought it has been in existence so long, it has never been brought into operation. The only time it was invoked was in February 1977 when the President of India promulgated an order which envisaged the setting-up of a development board for Kutch in Gujrat; but the order was not acted upon and was withdrawn 12 months later."

Palkhivala further opines that the imperative first step should be to advise the President to make a reference to the Supreme Court under Art. 143 of the Constitution so that the Government and the public have clear guidance on the baffling questions which arise under Art. 371. If action is taken thereafter under that Article in the light on the legal position elucidated by the Supreme Court, it would then be beyond the pale of controversy.

In support of his opinion he has argued that in case development board is established in any area without reference to the Supreme Court by the President, such action would create more problems than it would solve. It would aggravate political acrimony, and entail years of protracted litigation to decide several fundamental questions, including the following:-

(1) Are the provision of Art. 371 intended to supersede the normal process of free democracy, as in the case of President's rule under Art. 356 upon failure of the constitutional machinery in a State.

(2) In respect of matters covered by Art. 371, can the Governor exercise the executive and legislative powers which, but for the President's order under that Article, would fall squarely within the competence of the Council of Ministers and the State Legislature?

(3) Can development boards be invested with any administrative or executive power or are they merely to make recommendations and submit reports?

(4) Is the normal machinery for disbursing or dealing with State finances overridden by functions assigned to the Governor and the development boards under Art. 371?

(5) If an allocation of funds for developmental expenditure over a region is approved by the Governor, can it be debated, examined, altered or voted upon by the legislature, or does it become a sum charged on the Consolidated Fund of the State?

The points Palkhivala has raised clearly demonstrate that Art. 371 (2) is vague and cannot meet the expectations on the people of the region where such board is to be established.

Even the demand of the BJP that Jammu be given its due share of 41 assembly seats and Ladakh region 4 in the enlarged assembly of 87 seats, will not meet the political aspirations of Jammuites and Ladakhis. The BJP's hope that 45 legislators hailing from Jammu and Ladakh in a house of 87 will go a long way in playing an important and decisive role in the State politics and administration thought well conceived is impractical. Considering the past history, it can be authoritatively said that certain legislators from Jammu and Kargil would be the first to throw in their lot with the Kashmiri leadership and play to its tunes. Then what would other legislators belonging to Jammu and Ladakh do in the legislature. The Kashmiri leadership, by its power, would have its own way. (Jammu and Ladakh cannot and must not forget the pro-Kashmir role their Congress and National Conference legislators have played

during the past 43 years.)

Under the circumstances, the only option left before the people of Jammu and Ladakh is the vivisection of the State into three states of Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh. The political leaders and the Indian Government must realise that a more realistic trifurcation of the Jammu and Kashmir State would go a long way in achieving the much needed national unity and integrity, which today is standing in a most precarious position and in meeting the genuine political aspirations of all the three regions.

However, whatever be the shortcomings in the BJP's resolution and Bajpai's thesis, these have been fully compensated by the historic unity between BJP-LBA and the Kashmiri Pandits against Kashmiri domination. With this unity, an important chapter has been opened in the history of relations between Jammu-Ladakh and Kashmir—a chapter of revolutionary demands which promise to unite the two regions together in closer bonds than ever. (Jammu and Ladakh : BJP-LBA Unity', *Daily Excelsior*, September 16-17, 1990.

Appendix I

KASHMIR STATEMENT : JAMMU ALSO HAS A SAY

By Dr. Hari Om

The explosive situation in the Valley should focus attention on the plight of the other two regions of Jammu and Kashmir, which have been groaning under the Kashmiri yoke for long. While Jammu has been sitting on a volcano of discontent, convinced that only separate statehood can end its neglect, the Ladakhi Buddhist Association has been clamouring for Union Territory status to Ladakh to overcome the threat to the identity of its people. In other words, whereas volatile Kashmir is gripped by separatist sentiments, Jammu and Ladakh are keen on entering mainstream politics by snapping their political links with the Valley.

Their misgivings have been deepened by New Delhi's reported moves to revive the political process in the troubles-torn State by putting back in power those squarely responsible for bringing the Valley to this pass. The absence of any reference to Jammu in the January 1, 1991, parleys in New Delhi for "evolving a consensus on Kashmir" is interpreted as a sign of the Centre's refusal to learn any lesson from past mistakes and review the Kashmir policy it has pursued hitherto and end the apathy shown towards the inherent constitutional and economic rights of the people of Jammu.

What has added fuel to the fire is the impression that Mr. Chandra Shekhar at the behest of Dr. Farooq Abdullah is keen to amend the constitution to restore the 1953 political set-up, with the Centre handling only Defence, Foreign Affairs and Communication, in a bid to mollify the militants. Afraid that their case might go by default again, the people

of Jammu have shed their differences, political or otherwise, and started speaking in one voice to obtain their constitutional rights. The initiative to solve the Kashmir tangle could yield results only if the conflicting and mutually exclusive aspirations of Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh are satisfied within the framework of the Constitution.

Dr. Abdullah has gone back to London as mysteriously as he descended on Delhi from his overseas hideout to negotiate with the Centre his possible assumption of power by revoking the dissolution of the Assembly. His insinuation that the "anti-India feelings among the people of the Valley" have "their roots in the growing economic backwardness and unemployment" and "that we have to tackle them before we can win their confidence" is a travesty of truth.

The current phase of alienation of the people in Kashmir could be traced to the disastrous Rajiv-Farooq accord, which made the National Conference forfeit its position as the representative of the Kashmiri ethos, and the wholesale rigging of the 1917 elections which denied the Muslim United Front its due. More than Dr. Abdullah's abdication, the damage done to the sanctity of the democratic process set the stage for the rise of militancy and terrorism in the Valley.

Dr. Abdullah's insinuation may or may not succeed in moderating the militants' anger against him, but it has unambiguously reflected his total bias against Jammu and Ladakh, the two hapless "hostages" of Kashmir which are unworthy of any consideration under the present dispensation. Both these regions have suffered gross discrimination and political neglect during the last 43 years at the hands of the State and Central Governments.

New Delhi must not overlook the ferment that has gripped the whole State. There is every reason to fear that unless some concerted move is made and the genesis of the debacle in Kashmir and inter-regional acrimony and rancour analysed objectively and dispassionately, the best opportunity for salvaging the situation would be lost for ever.

While welcoming any sincere move on the part of the Centre to tackle the issues in the sensitive border State, which has become the playground of Pakistani agents, the people of Jammu would like to point out that any negotiation with the leadership of the State must also take cognizance of their political aspirations, compulsions and needs. The warning that no scheme of reform or concession would meet the real requirement of the situation if it does not make adequate provision for representing Jammu and Ladakh, which under the existing arrangement have little inducement to enter political life, must not be ignored.¹

1. *Hindustan Times*, New Delhi, March 1, 1991.

Appendix II

STATE OF JAMMU : ALIENATED FROM THE VALLEY

By Dr. Harl Om

The immediate fall-out of the disturbances in Kashmir is the growing demand for a separate State of Jammu. The demand unambiguously points to the consciousness of the danger of being submerged under the rising clamour for "azadi", plebiscite and the restoration of the pre-1953 political set-up.

The people of Jammu have been told, and are still being told by anti-Jammu elements that Kashmir is within India because Jammu and Ladakh are attached to it, and, if Kashmir is to be retained, Jammu and Ladakh have to sacrifice their legitimate politico-economic interests in favour of the Valley. The 1952 Delhi Agreement, the 1975 Indira-Sheikh Accord, and the 1987 Rajiv-Farooq Accord prove this point : all these agreements were made to strike a deal with the Kashmiri leadership over the heads of the people of Jammu and Ladakh.

Hope

Nationalists as they were and are, the people of Jammu have so far accepted this argument demur and have suffered happily and silently in the hope that Kashmir would one day join the national mainstream. But this arrangement has been rendered ineffective by their failure to secure even paltry concessions like the opening of an engineering college in Jammu and the setting up of Reasi, Kishtwar and Samba districts in the region from the rulers in the Valley, despite

the recommendations of the Gajendragadkar Commission (1967-68) and the Wazir Commission (1981-83).

The political domination of the Kashmir Valley over Jammu is evident from the fact that the Chief Minister is always from the Valley and so is the leadership of major political parties like the Congress (I) or Janta Dal. Jammu is also poorly represented in the State Secretariat with only 2-3 Secretaries out of about 35 and only about 10 per cent in the rest of the service. While about 40 per cent officials in the Jammu region are from the Valley, employees from the Jammu region do not constitute even 2 per cent of the total in Kashmir.

Such underrepresentation is evident in other spheres also. In the Lok Sabha, Jammu returns one member for every 1.4 lakh inhabitants while Kashmir one for every 10,000,00. Jammu has an area 70 per cent more than that of Kashmir and more than 45 per cent of the State's population. But Kashmir has 42 seats out of 75 in the State Assembly, leaving 31 and two for Jammu and Ladakh, respectively. While Jammu returns one member for every 90,000 inhabitants, Kashmir returns one for every 73,000.

No attention is paid to develop tourism in Jammu. About 95 per cent of the State's tourism budget is spent in the Valley every year, even though tourists who come to Jammu are three times more than those going to Kashmir. Power generation, too, is grossly neglected in the Jammu region. Chenani in Jammu is the only (State) power plant, producing a paltry 22 MW. The rest of the plants, namely, Upper Jhelum, Lower Jhelum, Upper Sindh, Mohra and Ganderwal, etc., are in the Valley with a production capacity of 328 M.W. While only Rs. 10 crores has been spent on the Chenani project, Rs. 500 crores has been spent on the Kashmir plants.

The same story of neglect is true of roads also. Jammu has a total area of 26,293 sq. km. and Kashmir 15,853 sq km. but in 1987 Jammu and 3,500 km of roads covering 18 per

cent of its area, whereas Kashmir had 4,900 km covering more than 40 per cent of its area. All the professional and technical institutions of the State are in the Kashmir Valley. These include the Post-Graduate Sher-e-Kashmir Institute of Medical Sciences, the Dental College, the Veterinary College, the Agricultural University, the Regional Engineering College, the Artificial Limb Centre, etc.

On the other hand, the Agricultural and Ayurvedic Colleges in Jammu have been closed down by the State Government despite protests by the people of Jammu. (Jammu's share in the Regional Engineering College, Srinagar, and Sher-e-Kashmir Agricultural University is just 30 per cent). All the major factories like the HMT Watch Factory, the telephone factory and the cement factory are in Kashmir.

The youth of Jammu virtually find no employment in the 12 Corporations whose headquarters are in Kashmir with almost 100 per cent of their employees from the Valley. Their opportunities have shrunk with the transfer of professional institutions like the veterinary college and the dental college, which were earlier sanctioned for Jammu, to Kashmir. The budget provisions for Jammu are meagre and unfair.

In the Prime Minister's special assistance programme of 1986, for instance, Jammu got just Rs. 15.5 crores which was about 8 per cent of the total assistance of Rs. 179.73 crores. Kashmir got Rs. 70.06 crores. Of the remaining Rs. 92.76 crores, which was meant for the common development programmes of all the regions of the State, more than Rs. 80 crores was allocated for Kashmir only.

The net result is widespread discontent, frustration and dissatisfaction. The sacrifices of the people of Jammu seem to have gone in vain. The grim situation prevailing in Kashmir at present eloquently proves this point. The anti-Jammu and separatist psyche of the Kashmiris coupled with the Centre's policy of appeasement has denied the people of Jammu their due share in the State's political process. Consequently,

they have suffered on all the three fronts-political, administrative and economic.

But now, when the political future of Jammu region is at stake, when most political parties are advocating revival of the political process and hinting at the possibility of negotiating with the subversives without ascertaining the views of the people of Jammu and Ladakh, when certain human rights associations and their leaders have almost joined the secessionists in denouncing the policy of the State Government, the people of Jammu can hardly be expected to view such developments like silent spectators.

The discrimination against Jammu seems to have assumed alarming proportions, threatening the region's very identity. Nearly all those who matter seem determined to ignore Jammu and Ladakh yet again in their desperate bid to placate the Kashmiri militants, forgetting the fate of the earlier agreements when the principle of protection of minorities which include the Hindus, the Sikhs, the Gujjars, the Dogras and the Panjabi Muslims was applied in the wrong way and when anti-national and pro-Pakistan elements are trying to disturb the communal amity in the Jammu region in the name of religion.

Right

The people of Jammu have the right to express their opinion on the kind of political set-up they want. They are within their rights to oppose any plebiscite and the restoration of the pre-1953 political arrangement. It is in this context that the demand for a separate Jammu State should be viewed.

It cannot be denied that Jammu's political aspirations are somewhat different from those of Kashmir. Jammu wants full integration with India. Jammu not only welcomes but also advocates the extension of Central laws to the State. On the contrary, the protagonists of the pre-1953 political set-up and the Kashmir-based National Conference leadership regard

all such changes as an erosion of Article 370. Such a sharp difference in approach and attitude unambiguously reflects one of the fundamental contradictions between Jammu and Kashmir.¹

1. *The Statesman*, Calcutta, June 20, 1990.

Appendix III

KASHMIR AND HUMAN RIGHTS CHAMPIONS

By Dr. Harl Om

India is passing through critical times as far as its unity is concerned. This grave situation is the handiwork of certain external and internal forces actively working against the unity and integrity of India.

One can understand the ulterior motive of Pakistan and the Kashmiri secessionists behind the unprecedented upsurge in Kashmir. But one fails to understand the real motive of the so-called Human Rights Associations like the People's Union for Civil Liberties (PUCL), the Citizens for Democracy (CFD), the Radical Humanist Association (RHA), and the Manav Ekta Abhiyan (MEA) and their leaders. Their report released to the press on April 26, (1990) has shaken all patriotic Indians.

The report is nothing but an affront to nationalist Indians and to the State. The report deserves outright condemnation by all right thinking people.

The so-called Human Rights Champions appear to have openly joined the secessionists and pro-Pakistani elements in denouncing the policy of the State Government and in supporting their demand of "independence and not Pakistan". Their views on the handling of the Kashmir situation are identical with those expressed repeatedly by the Pakistan Government, its print and electronic media and the Kashmiri secessionists. Pakistan has, undoubtedly, found in the persons of the Human Rights Champions a stick to beat India with and to malign the Indian nation in the eyes of the civilised world. Those

who had the opportunity of watching Pakistani television on April 28 and thereafter know the use Pakistani media has made and is still making of the reports of the Human Rights Champions.

Also, who doesn't know the use a certain section of the Kashmir bureaucracy, including a few senior IAS officials, has made of the findings of the Human Rights Champions in the memorandum submitted to the "Citizens of World". The bureaucracy has openly sought the intervention and support of the 'World Opinion' for achieving political emancipation from India . . . It needs to be emphasised that the memorandum contains details of the atrocities alleged to have been committed upon the Kashmiri Muslims by the para-military forces during Jagmohan's second tenure of four months, between January and May, 1990, when Girish Chandra Saxena was appointed the Governor of the trouble-ridden State.

Virtually no action against the erring officials has emboldened certain pro-Pakistani elements and subversives operating in the most vulnerable border districts of Rajouri and Poonch in the Jammu region to fan communalism, separatism and hatred. Alarming reports are regularly pouring in causing deep concern and anguish to the authorities and patriotic Indians. Loudspeakers of high intensity have been fitted "in many of the religious places and at several government buildings especially in schools". (*Daily Excelsior*,) June 22) Through these loudspeakers anti-India and pro-Pakistan slogans are blared. Propaganda is also being made using cassettes containing highly inflammatory and provocative speeches and slogans. The reports of "some Indian forces like People's Union for Civil Liberties (PUCL) and other such Human Rights Organisations" have further made the task of the pro-Pakistani elements quite easy. Indeed the report of the Human Rights Champions has encouraged militancy in the otherwise peaceful areas and complicated the already rather complex Kashmir problem.

The report appears one-sided and biased and seems to be

based on the information the Human Rights Champions have gathered from those responsible for the present upsurge in the Valley.

(The Government must also consider the possibility of banning Human Rights Associations which are spreading disinformation.¹)

1. *The National Herald*, New Delhi/Lucknow, July 20, 1990.

Appendix-IV

KASHMIR CRISIS : HARD FACTS AND SUGGESTIONS

By Dr. Hari Om

The debate in the Lok Sabha on August 19 (1990) on the official bill seeking approval of the proclamation of president's rule in Jammu and Kashmir and the Armed Forces (J&K) Special Powers Bill unambiguously proves that the V.P. Singh's Government is in deep waters. An influential section of leaders in the ruling and opposition parties expressed itself differently over the genesis of and solution to the ongoing upsurge in Kashmir for 'Azadi' making the prevailing confusion about the sensitive national issue more confounded. What was most surprising was the advocacy of a strange thesis that the potent causes responsible for the Kashmir crisis are (1) an erosion of Kashmiri identity caused by the extension of certain Central laws, (2) unemployment of Kashmiri youth and (3) Kashmir's underdevelopment. While doing so, this brand of leadership made no reference to the surfacing and resurfacing of inherent fundamental contradictions existing between Jammu and Kashmir and between the latter and Ladakh and thus ignored the hard realities.

The fact is that right from October 26, 1947, political power, decision-making, administration at higher levels, better deal in matters relating to employment, location of prestigious institutions and factories and funds for development have become the privileges of Kashmir alone with the people of Jammu and Ladakh becoming "hostage" to the fickle leadership of the Valley.

The political domination of Kashmir over the State is

evident from the fact that the Chief Minister is always from the Valley and so is the leadership of the major political parties like the Congress (I), the Janta Dal and the National Conference. The excessive and preponderant share of representation to Kashmir is discernible in the Assembly and Parliament. Kashmir has an area nearly 90 per cent less than that of Jammu and Ladakh and about half of the State population. But Kashmir has 42 seats out of 75 in the Assembly, leaving 31 and 2 for Jammu and Ladakh, respectively. While Kashmir returns one member for every 73,000 residents, Jammu returns one member for every 90,000. Similarly, in Parliament, Kashmir returns one member for every one million population and Jammu returns one for every 1.4 million.

Kashmir's hegemony over the State politics and the Centre's policy of pampering the Kashmiri leadership is visible in the 1952 Delhi Agreement, the 1975 Indira-Sheikh Accord and the 1987 Rajiv-Farooq Accord. While the 1952 Delhi Agreement provided for limited accession of the State to the Indian Union, the one entered into 1975 sought to make Article 370 of the Indian Constitution a permanent feature. The 1987 Accord was, on the other hand, nothing but an alliance between Rajiv and Farooq to share political power in the State.

All these agreements were made to strike a deal with Kashmir over the heads of the people of Jammu and Ladakh. In fact, each one of these stories has been that of betrayal of the people of Jammu. Everytime the Central and Kashmiri leaders made solemn promises to respect the personality of Jammu and safeguard its legitimate rights. Unfortunately, the action of the powers-that-be, whether in Kashmir or in Delhi, gave a lie to the pronouncements made with full solemnity.

Ladakh like Jammu, too, feels humiliated. The resurfacing of the slogan for Union Territory status one year after the Ladakhi Buddhist Association (LBA) started its agitation, on July 7, 1989, is the immediate fall-out of the delay in implementing the promises made by the State and Central Govern-

ments. It may be recalled that LBA had abandoned its agitation late last year following an agreement with the State Government in which Mr. Buta Singh, the then Union Home Minister, had helped in assuring the Buddhists of an autonomous District Council. The inordinate delay in implementing this agreement and another notification which sought to declare communities in Ladakh as Scheduled Tribes is responsible for fomenting the present trouble. Even the recent assurances given by Mufti Mohammad Sayeed, Union Home Minister, and Mr. George Fernandes, Union Railway Minister, have not been implemented. The LBA is blaming the Mufti and others for sabotaging the implementation of the notification.

Poor Job Opportunities

The youth of Jammu and Ladakh virtually find no employment in the 12 corporations whose headquarters are in Kashmir with almost 100 per cent of their employees from the Valley. So is the case with Directorates, Universities and professional and technical institutions. The opportunities for the Kashmiri youth have increased further with the transfer of professional institutions like the veterinary and dental colleges, which were earlier sanctioned for Jammu to Kashmir. Besides, all the professional and technical institutions of the State are in the Valley.

Kashmir's share in the Regional Engineering College, Sher-e-Kashmir Institute of Medical Sciences and Sher-e-Kashmir Agriculture University is over 75 per cent. (This was the situation before the rise of militancy. Now, none from Jammu goes to Srinagar.) In addition, the headquarters of almost all the banks and the Central Government offices are in the Valley. All the major factories like the HMT watch factory, the telephone factory, the cement factory and the television factory, too, are in Kashmir providing additional employment opportunities to the Kashmiris.

Disproportionate development in Kashmir is evident in spheres relating to tourism, power generation and roads.

About 95 per cent of the State's tourism budget is spent in the Valley every year, even though tourists who come to Jammu and Ladakh are three times more than those going to Kashmir. (This was the case before the emergence of the on-going secessionist militancy in Kashmir.) Chenani in Jammu is the only State power plant producing a paltry 22 MW. The rest of the power plants, namely, Upper Jhelum, Lower Jhelum, Upper Sindh, Mohra and Gandarwal, etc; are in Kashmir producing 328 MW. In addition, there are a number of gas turbines to cater to the needs of the Kashmiris. While Rs 500 crores has been spent on the Kashmir plants, a paltry sum of Rs. 10 crores has been spent on the Chenani project. The same story of development is true of roads.

The expenditure incurred in Kashmir is much higher than that incurred in Jammu and Ladakh. In the Prime Minister's Special Assistance Programme of 1986, for instance, Kashmir got Rs. 70.06 crores of the total of Rs. 179.73 crores. Jammu got just Rs. 15.5 crores, which was about 8 per cent of the total. Of the remaining Rs. 92.76 crores, which was meant for the common development programme of all the regions of the State, about Rs. 80 crores was allocated for Kashmir only. The story of Rs. 70,000 crores the Central Government pumped into the State during the last 43 years for its development is no different.

Still, the Kashmiris may have some genuine grievances. These should be sorted out within the framework of the Indian Constitution. The Kashmir problem is certainly not the outcome of religious persecution of the Muslims or the alleged arosion of the Kashmiri identity or the economic discontent. The causes are, undoubtedly, deeper. These are (1) the growing fundamentalism which is engulfing the globe with the prominent among its victims being USSR and India; (2) Pakistan's open and blatant interference in Kashmir affairs; (3) financial aid from Iran and Saudi Arabia; (4) wrong policies of the Central and the State Governments and (5) inherent contradictions between Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh.

It needs to be emphasised that the State of Jammu and Kashmir is an accident of history. It has no inherent unity. The compulsions, interests and the needs of the people of Jammu and Ladakh are totally different from those of the Kashmiris. In fact, they are conflicting and mutually exclusive. The people of Jammu and Ladakh want full integration with India. They not only welcome but also advocate extension of the Central laws to the State. They advocate the importance and necessity of one constitution and one flag. They see in the Indian Constitution provisions which can satisfy their legitimate politico-administrative and social aspirations. They believe that the accession of the State to the Indian Union is final and irrevocable. They, in addition, are rabidly opposed to the restoration of the pre-1953 political set-up and the Kashmiris' fight for 'Azadi'.

On the contrary, the National Conference leader of the Valley not only want a constitution different from the Indian Constitution but also advocate the acceptance of the 1952 Delhi Agreement or the restoration of the 1953 political arrangement. The Kashmir militants are working on two options (1) to join Muslim Pakistan or (2) to remain independent of India and Pakistan. The secessionists are advocating a solution of the Kashmir imbroglio under the 1948-49 U.N. Resolutions and the 1972 Shimla Agreement believing that the issue is still wide open. In other words, while Jammu and Ladakh appear determined to snap their political ties with Kashmir (on the one hand, the LBA is up in revolt against Kashmir demanding Union Territory status for Ladakh, on the other, the Jammu Mukti Morcha (JMM) is reportedly busy making preparations to press for the demand of statehood to Jammu), the Valley leadership seems firm on severing Kashmir's links with India.

Conflicting perceptions

The fact is that the people of Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh belong to different philosophies, social customs and culture which are based on conflicting ideas and concepts. They derive their inspiration from different sources of history. Very often

the hero of the one is quite the opposite of the other. To keep together such people under a single state must lead to a growing discontent and ultimate destruction of any system that may be so built for the government of such State.

The presence of so many fundamental contradictions between Jammu and Kashmir and between the latter and Ladakh, the adherence to the Shimla Agreement and Pakistan's occupation of the so-called Azad Kashmir are the basic problems. The solution to these problems is very simple. What is required is determination, firmness, consensus and statesmanship. The Centre should reject the U.N. Resolutions of 1948-49 and the 1972 Shimla Agreement. It should not only take immediate steps to reoccupy Pakistan Occupied Kashmir (POK) but also trifurcate the State into Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh States. The rejection of the U.N. Resolutions and the Shimla Agreement and the reoccupation of POK would settle the Kashmir issue once for all making Srinagar and Islamabad Believe that they would no more be allowed any undue latitude endangering the unity, integrity and sovereignty of India.

The trifurcation of the State would be beneficial not only for the people of Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh, but for the whole of India. Freed from the suspicion generated in the Kashmiri mind regarding the regional and communal aspirations of the people of Jammu and Ladakh, the Kashmiris will be able to seek a future for themselves. They are bound to realise that they can find their real identity in democratic India rather than in Pakistan or in independence.¹

1. *The Hindu*, Madras, October 2, 1990. Also see 'Flames in Kashmiri : turmoil in Jammu', *The Voice of Millions*, New Delhi, 15, 22 June, 1990.

Appendix V

CHAMPIONS OF HUMAN RIGHTS

By Dr. Hari Om

One can understand the ulterior motive of Pakistan and the Kashmiri secessionists behind the unprecedented upsurge in Kashmir. But one fails to understand the real motive of the so-called Human Rights Associations like the People's Union for Civil Liberties (PUCL), the Citizens for Democracy (CFD), the Radical Humanist Association (RHA) and the Manav Ekta Abhiyan (MEA) and their leaders. Their report on Kashmir released to the press on April 26 (1990) has shaken all patriotic Indians. The report is nothing but an affront to nationalist Indians and to the State. The report deserves outright condemnation by all-right thinking people.

The so-called Human Rights Champions appear to have openly joined the secessionists and pro-Pakistani elements in denouncing the policy of Jagmohan's government and in supporting their demand of "independence and not Pakistan". Their views on the handling of the Kashmir situation are identical with those expressed repeatedly by the Pakistan Government, its print and electronic media, and the Kashmiri secessionists. Pakistan has found in the persons of the so-called Human Rights Champions a stick to beat India with and to malign India in the eyes of the civilised world. Those who had the opportunity to watch Pakistan television on April 28 know the use Pakistan media has made of the report of the Human Rights Champions.

The report appears one-sided and seems to be based on the information the Human Rights Champions have gathered from those responsible for the upsurge in the Valley. The

observations and allegations against the Jagmohan government which the report embodies appear baseless and wild. The report includes such charges and allegations as "...Jagmohan administration was creating panic among the Pandits by threatening to carry out house to house combing operations to find out pro-Pakistan militants in which the Pandits may also get killed." "The Governor has preferred to pay compensation to families of non-Muslim victims who were considered to be informers but, so far, not a single penny has been paid to many more such families of Muslim victims". "Everywhere people gave heart-rending accounts of how security forces were gunning down innocent Muslim population of the Valley" and "total alienation of the entire Muslim population of the Valley from India ...and due to the highly repressive policy pursued by the administration in recent months, especially since the advent of Mr Jagmohan, their alienation has now turned into bitterness and anger".

Even a cursory glance at the press report constaining the above views is sufficient to doubt the loyalty of the so-called Human Rights Champions towards their own country, India. Besides, the report has made certain absurd demands such as lifting of curfew and allowing the Kashmiri Muslims to demonstrate. Lifting of curfew and allowing the Kashmiri Muslims to demonstrate in the prevailing situation mean victory of the secessionists and pro-Pakistani elements and a tool for secession. The Human Rights Champions have apparently ignored (a) innumerable demonstrations the Kashmiri secessionists organised a month ago to incite people to acts of treason and violence, (b) the anti-India and pro-Pakistan slogans raised during these demonstrations, (c) observance of black days and nights on such festive occasions as Independence Day and Republic Day, (d) the secessionists' plan of declaring Kashmir the Islamic Republic of Kashmir on January 26, 1990 and the remarkable role Jagmohan played in saving Kashmir by his timely action, (e) the reign of terror let loose by the militants and the parallel government that they ran before the imposition of curfew and house to house combing operations to nab them and smash their network, (f) the

terrorists' attacks on the para-military forces, open defiance of the State authority and the kidnapping and brutal killings of peace-loving, nationalist and law-abiding people and the closure of shops, cinemas, banks, industrial establishments and what not. Have these champions gone into the circumstances leading to the imposition of curfew and action by the administration and the para-military forces?

Have they forgotten the threats to the Kashmiri Pandits and other non-Muslims that they must leave the Valley within 48 hours or face physical liquidation? Have they forgotten the atrocities alleged to have been committed by the Muslim fundamentalists on the non-Muslims of Kashmir which include Kashmiri Pandits, Panjabis, Sikhs and Dogras? Have they ever visited the camps in Jammu, Delhi and elsewhere where the Kashmiri Pandits and others are languishing for want of necessities? Have they ever cared to listen to the woes of the migrants? Had they investigated and properly analysed all the aspects of the Kashmir problem, their conclusions would have been certainly different, unbiased and objective.

The report leave no one in doubt that the so-called Human Rights Champions are worried more for the militants' aspirations than for the miseries of the peaceful Muslims in the Valley, the migrants in Jammu and elsewhere and their national interests.

The time has come when the authorities and Indian nationalists and patriots should discuss and decide whether the disinformation now openly circulated by the so-called Human Rights Champions and extensively used by Pakistan is conducive to the preservation of unity and integrity of India. If they come to the conclusion that it is not, then they should ask the so-called Human Rights Champions to openly dissociate themselves from such one-sided anti-India activities. In case they refuse to do so, patriotic Indians must boycott them and the national press must ignore them. The Government has done well in banning the secessionist outfits and smashing their network. These steps are not enough. The

Government must also consider the possibility of banning such Human Rights associations as are spreading disinformation, encouraging traitors and harming the interests of the Indian nation. Any move which aims at breeding demoralisation in Jagmohan's administration and in para-military forces must be countered. At the same time, the Government must mitigate the hardships which long hours of curfew entail.¹

1. *Indian Express*, New Delhi, May 15, 1990. See also *The Organiser*, New Delhi, June 2, 1990.

Appendix VI

DEBACLE IN KASHMIR

By Dr. Hari Om

Debacle in Kashmir unequivocally reflects the collapse of the unrealistic and pseudo secular policies Pt. Nehru, Mrs. Indira Gandhi and Mr. Rajiv Gandhi evolved for the sensitive border State. Manifestations of their erroneous concept of nationalism and secularism are discernible in many an action squarely responsible for the present impasse.

Pt. Nehru can be legitimately accused of inapt handling of the J & K question. Rejection of Maharaja Hari Singh's offer of accession of the State to the Indian Union and its subsequent acceptance when the Kashmir-based National Conference (NC) supremo, Sheikh Abdullah, communicated his no-objection ; detachment of the State from the Union Home Ministry and its attachment with the Foreign Ministry as if it was an alien country; obsession with Lord Mountbatten who dared exercise plenipotentiary powers which he was not entitled to and committed on his own a plebiscite in Kashmir to Mr. Jinnah; unpolitic reference of Pak aggression on Kashmir to the UNO which enabled the Western World to play nefarious diplomacy in the region and uncalled for strict enforcement of ceasefire when the Indian Army was putting the tribal raiders and Pak Army to rout ; undemocratic replacement of Mehr Chand Mahajan by the Sheikh as the State Prime Minister and forced exile of Hari Singh from the State; dismissal of the counsels of Sardar Patel and Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerjee and creation of Kashmir republic within the Indian Republic through Art. 370 of the Indian Constitution which met the separatist urge of the NC for a separate constitution and a flag ; arbitrary and wide latitude accorded

to the Sheikh to shape not only the political destiny of Kashmiris but also of Jammuites and Ladakhis who otherwise favoured full integration with India and general distrust of Jammuites and Ladakhis that ran through the whole course of Kashmir policy and, last but not the least, the 1952 truce whereby the Sheikh forced New Delhi to handle only Defence, Foreign Affairs and Communication, leaving the rest to the care of Kashmiris, unambiguously suggest the sowing of seeds of secession right on October 26, 1947 as also Pt. Nehru's major concern for Kashmiri Muslims and as such total bias against Jammu and Ladakh.

In fact, pampering of inconstant and fickle leadership of the Valley was the corner-stone of Pt. Nehru's policy. Not surprisingly, his unrealistic policy bore bitter fruit and the Congress was hoist with its own petard when in 1952 the Sheikh affronted India challenging the very accession. That Pt. Nehru bemoaned for the follies he had committed became evident when he remorsefully remarked: "Kashmir is lost to us". It may be recalled that the Sheikh had been dreaming of—and working towards—a Switzerland type independent Kashmir. And towards the dangerous direction the Sheikh was drifting, Pt. Nehru had to agree "though reluctantly and painfully", to his arrest on August 9, 1953.

The arrest was taken to mean the corrective of history—a confession of blunders and a reversal of Kashmir policy. Bakshi Ghulam Mohd., who succeeded the Sheikh, addressed himself to the task of bridging the gulf the Sheikh had widened between Kashmiris and India. G.M. Sadiq took a more substantial step when he in 1965 dissolved the NC and substituted it by the Congress. With Sadiq thus commenced an era full of hope and promise for the future. The Sheikh's indulgence in the activities considered prejudicial to India's interests and security were enquired into, and quoting an intelligence Chief, 'a cast-iron case' was established against him. But the bungling instinct of the Congress resurrected. Disregarding the law of the land and eschewing national interests, the Congress ordered withdrawal of the 'famous conspiracy case' against a

'seditious Sheikh', condoning all of his anti-India deeds.

Far more amazing was the 1975 Indira-Sheikh Accord which not only catapulted 'a deflated Sheikh' back to power but also empowered him to review all Central Laws extended to the State since 1953. The immediate fall-out of the truce was a virtual eclipse of the Congress party's independent status in Kashmir and revival to its pristine glory of the totally undependable, rabidly communal and anti-Jammu and Ladakh NC. Defending the unjust and unpolitic truce, Mrs. Gandhi told the nation that "all that was being done was to allow the Kashmiris greater sense of participation and encourage them to shed their exclusiveness and join the national mainstream".

If, indeed, it was so and the innovation was conceived as a bold well-meaning experiment, it should have been allowed a fair trial. But the Congress bungled again. Mrs. Gandhi's lust for absolute power and concern for party interests, bedevilled the chances of its own formulation from the very take off. Instead of eschewing party interests, she started pressurising the Sheikh for unbridled power in the government, and when he refused to yield, the Congress assumed a confrontationalist posture unleashing a tirade against him. The resultant acrimony led to the fall of the Sheikh's Ministry (1977).

The engineered fall of the Sheikh proved counter-productive. When fresh elections were ordered and the Sheikh won a massive victory in Kashmir, the Congress took to conspiratorial activities to destabilise the Sheikh's dispensation. "Anti-India elements" were incited to keep the Sheikh on tenterhooks, especially after 1980 when Mrs. Gandhi recaptured power in New Delhi. To counteract the Congress onslaught, retain power and further consolidate his support-base in the Valley, the Sheikh sought refuge in pandering more and more to the sectarian, parochial and fissiparous tendencies and arousing anti-India feelings. The Congress intrigue to regain the ground lost and the Sheikh's resolve to hold his own obviously widened the differences between Kashmiris and India.

Dr. Farooq Abdullah's case was no different. After her rout against the Sheikh, Mrs. Gandhi pinned her hope in the former's son, Dr. Abdullah. When the Sheikh died in 1982 she bestowed chief ministership on Dr. Abdullah ignoring his open threat administered at the time of his installation as the NC President that "he would teach India a lesson for having troubled his father". She apparently disregarded his antecedents, his shallow roots in Kashmir politics, his anti-India stance while living in UK and his allegedly being in the JKLF camp, as late as 1973. She perhaps blundered in the belief that if the arrogant Sheikh had refused to the her line, his son could be easily obliged to obey her dictates.

Aspirations of Mrs. Gandhi got frustrated when Dr. Abdullah outrightly rejected the seat adjustment proposal on Congress terms during the 1983 assembly poll. This was enough to provoke Mrs. Gandhi. She made Dr. Abdullah the target of a vilification campaign, borrowing charges levelled by the BJP against him all along in the past. Ultimately, the Congress manipulated to subvert his government by engineering defections.

It was indeed sheer political debauchery and the height of Machiavellianism on the part of Mrs. Gandhi to have overlooked grave allegations against Dr. Abdullah as long as he obliged her and championed the cause of the Congress in the civic elections in Delhi but condemned him as a suspect and framed charges against him only when he refused to honour her directions. Dr. Abdullah was thus dismissed not for acts considered injurious to the national cause but for divorcing the Congress and Mrs. Gandhi.

Mrs. Gandhi had already dismissed the Bhandari Ministry in Sikkim and the Hagde's and NTR'S governments were on her hit list. This was perhaps the part of the strategy she had evolved to demolish the opposition governments in the states before parliamentary elections were ordered so that she could put puppet governments there to rig the elections. On this count no non-conformist duly elected government had the

right to rule if Mrs. Gandhi happened to be in power in New Delhi. This was not just a matter of bungling but a deliberate move which subverted federal Constitution and portended the rise of authoritarianism and one-party rule manifested in totalitarian political doctrines.

Mrs. Gandhi, undoubtedly, gave a new orientation to the Indian politics by injecting a nakedly unscrupulous manipulative politics to ensure the Congress rule at both the Centre and in the States. Her sole motto appeared to be to govern, rather misgovern, unhindered. Her repertoire was a blend of nasty formulae, like playing the people by administering a deadly poison of casteism and communalism, fomenting defections and rigging elections. She applied all these 'in the garb of national concern whereas deep down at work in her mind were 'baser instincts' to malign, humble and finish the opposition, the backbone of democracy.

Doubtful credentials of Dr. Abdullah notwithstanding, the coup against him constituted a grave assault on the democratic character of the Constitution and set a dangerous precedent. Turning down of Dr. Abdullah's demand to test his majority on the floor of the assembly or to seek a fresh mandate after dissolving the house in the face of the Lok Sabha Speaker's Address of April 6, 1968, to the State Legislative Presiding Officers' Conference, the Administrative Reforms Commission's (1968) recommendations on this subject and the imperatives of the J&K Anti-defection Law, the recommendations of the Report of the Committee of Governors in 1971 on the role of Governors in such an eventuality and, last but not the least, the 1977 J&K Precedence in this connection. further blackened the Congress face beyond recognition and shook Kashmiris' faith in the sincerity of New Delhi.

Whom Mrs. Gandhi made the Chief Minister after the dismissal of Dr. Abdullah? G.M. Shah, an ardent champion of the Plebiscite Front and an advocate of the doctrine that "the fight of 1946 (Quit Kashmir Movement) was yet incom-

plete". He was the same Shah who had the temerity to threaten the then state Governor, B.K. Nehru, to sign the anti-India Resettlement Act or resign, and whom Mrs. Gandhi had dubbed "undesireable" at the time of Dr. Abdullah's coronation as the Chief Minister (1982).

If the acts of Pt. Nehru and Mrs. Gandhi came as a rude shock, the varied activities of Mr. Rajiv Gandhi were no less so. If any thing, the Shah had landed the State in utter chaos, anarchy and uncertainty. The situation under him had turned so alarming that curfew had to be imposed and reimposed for hours, nay for days together, bringing the entire activity in the Valley to a grinding-halt. The worst happened when in 1986 communal riots rocked the Valley on an unprecedented scale. Everywhere the targets were the Pandits and their temples. Order could be restored only after the imposition of Governor rule and the strict enforcement of the law of the land. Mr. Gandhi withdrew his party's support from the Shah Ministry and befriended the same Dr. Abdullah whom Mrs. Gandhi had dismissed not very long ago. Dr. Abdullah was put back in the Chief Minister's chair.

The greed for power culminated into what is politically known as the 1987 Rajiv-Farooq Accord. Besides proving a last nail in the coffin of the Congress, the Accord demolished the NC citadel in the Valley. Dr. Abdullah earned the wrath of the Kashmiris who dismissed the former as "Delhi's stooge". Fearing large scale reverses in the assembly elections of the same year, Dr. Abdullah resorted to all possible malpractices, the worst being the gross-misuse of police and administrative apparatus to manipulate election results in his favour. And what proved a turning point was the forcible eviction of one Aijaz Dar, a Muslim United Front activist, from the counting-hall of Amirakadal constituency "by the police and the NC candidate". The humiliation made Dar roar right in front of the counting-hall: "He and his friends would shoot Farooq and other NC leaders as well as top police and civil officers and other prominent persons".

However, Dar was killed in a police "encounter" and with his death commenced an era of terrorism and militancy with the cult of bomb and AK 47 taking a particularly alarming turn.

The roots of the debacle in Kashmir lay not in the economic under-development or unemployment of Kashmiri youth as has been recently insinuated by Dr. Abdullah and leaders of his ilk but in the unrealistic, pseudo-secular and appeasement policy pursued by Pt. Nehru, Mrs. Gandhi and Mr. Gandhi as also in the scale each one of them used while enthroning or dethroning the Sheikh, Dr. Abdullah and the Shah, and measuring their nationalism or otherwise. The Sheikh, Dr. Abdullah and the Shah were just contributory factors. (Daily Excelsior, January 8, 1991)

Appendix VII

JAMMU AND KASHMIR : POLITICALLY NAIVE BUT DEADLY DANGEROUS INITIATIVES

By Dr. Harl Om

The January 1, 1991 New Delhi dinner meeting of Prime Minister, Mr. Chandra Shekhar, and Dr. Farooq Abdullah, a former Chief Minister, and some other "discredited political drop-outs from the Valley and Jammu region" to discuss the timing of the start of political process in the trouble-torn Kashmir and the revival of the dissolved Assembly and the alleged January 11 offer of the Prime Minister to hold discussions with the Kashmiri militants "on changing the present status of Kashmir" (Daily Excelsior, Jan. 12) have evoked reaction and response on lines expected. Those responsible for the insurgency in Kashmir have hailed the initiatives as solid and substantial and a great step forward in breaking the stalemate. For how else one would explain the ecstasy of Mr. Bahaudin Farooqi, Chairman of the J&K People's Rights (Protection) Committee and former Chief Justice of the J&K High Court, who on January 13 went to the extent of asking Mr. Chandra Shekhar to "clarify whether the Union Government was sincerely prepared to implement the mandate of Art. 253 of the (Indian) Constitution" and demand "impartial plebiscite under the auspices of a neutral agency like the United Nations". More or less similar is the jubilation of flamboyant Dr. Abdullah and Prof. Salf-Ud-Din Soz, who are calling for a reversion to the pre-1953 position, no matter whatever rhetorical pronouncements they make. The BJP, on the other extreme, has dubbed Mr. Chandra Shekhar's initiatives as "politically naive but deadly dangerous".

What has, however, surprised more is the line at least two

of the participants in the Delhi parleys adopted which was at complete variance with that of Dr. Abdullah's. Mr. Mohd. Shafi Qureshi, the State PCC(I) Chief, sprang a surprise when he vehemently opposed the idea of political process as, according to him, the time is not yet ripe. Mr. Janak Raj Gupta, Congress(I) MP from Jammu region, on the other hand, created a flutter when he reportedly put the entire blame for the revolt in Kashmir on the NC-Congress cynical and wily politicians whose Machiavellian designs cracked up the State administration surrendering the innocent Kashmiris to the gun-wielding militants and who ran away for their lives to other places in India and abroad. The Congress(I) stance at the meeting was thus an indication that quite a few of its leaders are against playing a second fiddle once again to the NC.

The rigid stand Mr. Qureshi and Mr. Gupta took not only marred the prospects of the success of the Delhi conclave but also enhanced sharply factional rivalries. Both the leaders made their intention public by refusing to toe the line of Mr. Ghulam Rasool Kar, former PCC(I) Chief, and an arch rival of Mr. Qureshi. Mr. Kar had a day earlier urged the Prime Minister to involve in the dialogue the People's Conference, People's League, Action Committee, Muslim United Front and Jamat-e-Islami (all militant outfits) and "If need be" even "the militants".

It bears recalling that the dinner meeting was a truncated one where "undesirables" reigned supreme. Those deemed unaccommodating were rigorously excluded. The BJP, which has a sizeable presence in Jammu, and the Ladakhi Buddhists Association (LBA), which led a powerful movement in the late 1989 in the trans-Himalayan Ladakh for Union Territory status, for instance, were not invited.

Taking the exclusion as an affront, the BJP Executive met at Jammu on January 17 and took stock of the political situation. In the meeting a number of speeches condemned the controversial moves. Introducing the resolution, Mr. Radha

Krshan Sharma, party Vice-President, remarked that "the tragedy is the only imperative if his (Mr. Chandra Shekhar's) plans succeed". Warning New Delhi of "dire consequences", Mr. Sharma urged the nationalist people in the State in particular and the country in general to support the BJP in its campaign for "thwarting the suicidal approach".

Very vague support of Mr. Mufti Mohd. Syed, Janta Dal leader and former Union Home Minister, and Mr. Sheikh Abdul Rehman, State Janta Dal (Socialist) Chief, notwithstanding, a profound cleavage of opinion thus exist in the State with regard to the political process with the BJP leaders, of course, more severe than anyone else, in their criticism of the initiatives. The BJP reaction can be gauged from its resolution which reads: "No dilution of the quantum of integration already achieved of the State with the Union will be tolerated . . . The ugly designs to revert to the 1953 or 47 constitutional position of Jammu and Kashmir . . . will be defeated . . . Campaign for the abrogation of Art. 370 of the Union Constitution would be intensified and no settlement on the future dispensation of the State reached without the consent of the people of Jammu and Ladakh, the migrants and the Gujjars and Bakrwals will be acceptable . . . and that in that event (if any of the demands is ignored) they will be free to determine their future in their own way".

But this was not unexpected. The BJP has all along opposed such moves and maintained that "no meaningful effort at parleys to sort out the Kashmir imbroglio can be made unless terrorism is crushed once for all". It still holds the same view for obvious reasons. The situation in Kashmir is as alarming as it was a year ago. The secessionist militancy continues to thrive in the Valley with the Pak Premier, Mr. Nawaz Sharif, providing all possible help in a bid to annex Kashmir. The observance in Kashmir in a big way of Republic Day as "Black Day" and 40 hours "Civil Curfew" from 4 PM on January 25 with the Kashmiris remaining indoors and Government employees not attending any function in connection with the Republic Day celebrations to escape

militants' wrath and physical liquidation clearly reflect that despite the best efforts, the security forces have not succeeded in breaking the backbone of the militants whose writ still reigns supreme in the Valley.

The confessions of Mr. N.K. Tewary, DY. IGP, CRPF, Kashmir Valley that "there are about 4,000 trained Hizbul Mujabideen activists still operating in Kashmir with most sophisticated weapons" and that about the same number is awaiting entry into the State further strengthens the BJP logic that "with the huge influx from across the border in the near future, the militancy is bound to increase". Viewed in the light of such indicators of consequence, the only sensible conclusion is that no objective situation obtains in the Valley at present to justify holding of talks with the forces of dissent of any political hue.

Condemning the Delhi parleys as an effort on the part of Mr. Rajiv Gandhi and Dr. Abdullah to regain power in the State as "they cannot survive without the oxygen of power" and to demand "their pound of flesh" from Mr. Chandra Shekhar who needs their active support to save his minority Government, the BJP expressed its profound dissatisfaction at the absence of a democratic Government in Jammu where complete normalcy prevails. It is indeed an irony that Mr. Chandra Shekhar is so eager to please and conciliate the Kashmiri militants whose watchword is "Azadi" and methodology AK-47 and Rocket Launcher, but is totally cold and indifferent towards Jammu whose battlecry is complete integration with India and *modus operandi* constitutional.

Unique is Jammu's love for India and unique is its patience. It is seething with all round discontent but is refraining from creating an ugly situation on the lines of Kashmir although it can legitimately do so. The lull in Jammu is, however, likely to break any time. The chances for a bitter struggle seem bright with the Jammu Mukti Morcha (JMM) holding out a threat to resist the latest onslaught, the Jammu People Front (JPF) unequivocally demanding "political power

for Jammu and full authority in dealing with its affairs" and the BJP vociferously resolving to force New Delhi to hold elections to Panchayats, Municipalities and other local bodies; restore "unnecessarily" stopped developmental work; obtain for Jammu its rightful share in the State power process through the creation of Regional Development Council; achieve 41 seats in the Assembly; and implement the Wazir Commission Report by setting up three districts of Reasi, Samba (Bahu) and Kishtwar. Other demands of the BJP include (a) a lesson to Pakistan to make it keep its hands off Kashmir, (b) destruction of terrorist training camps in POK and on the Pak soil and (c) a white paper on the Kashmir situation to remove the misgivings of the people.

With the unequivocal declaration that "in case the Government chooses to ignore our demands, especially the setting-up of Regional Councils (for Jammu, Kashmir And Ladakh) in time (within two months), the BJP will launch an agitation on the pattern of the historic 1953 Praja Parishad movement", the State has entered an era of yet another conflict. One thing is clear after sifting the pages containing the resolution. This is that a conflict is in the offing and what that conflict will be cannot be in doubt.

The conflict can still be averted. A search must be made to find out lasting solutions to the issues afflicting different regions of the State. But the search can move forward only if the Prime Minister and Mr. Girish Chandra Saxena, the State Governor, can be persuaded to face the reality of the situation. The reality is that Jammu and Ladakh have been grossly neglected and discriminated against and Kashmir unduly pampered. The best they can hope for is a compromise which does not amount to trifurcation of the State. The scurry in Jammu and Ladakh to accuse Srinagar and New Delhi of doing nothing to serve their cause is not ludicrous.

The only opening possible to salvage Jammu and Ladakh's pride lies in their political empowerment (statehood for Jammu and Union territory status for Ladakh) and solution

2.6 *Debacle in Kashmr*

to Kashmir imbroglio in realistic and firm policy. Clamour for reversion to the pre-1953 position or for a free and impartial plebiscite should not be taken lightly. Both these are an index of the clout the pro-Pak secessionists enjoy in Kashmir. The "undesirables" must be made accountable for whatever mischief they are upto. (*Daily Excelsior*, February 6, 1991)

Appendix VIII

JAMMU AND KASHMIR : POLITICO— CONSTITUTIONAL STATUS

By Dr. Hari Om

A serious controversy is going on over the politico-constitutional status of Jammu & Kashmir. What has given the controversy an alarming twist and baffled the people of Jammu is the frivolity implicit in the clearly Kashmir oriented politico-administrative and economic "package" recently suggested by "a group of Kashmir experts" to end the "alienation" of Kashmiris from the national mainstream. Associated with the group were : former Chief Minister, Mir Qasim, former State Chief Secretaries, N.K. Mukherji and P.K. Dave, eminent journalist, Kuldip Nayar, and a former Secretary to the Prime Minister, P.N. Dhar.

Apart from several economic and administrative measures, the experts' report on Kashmir contains such suggestions as (a) the future status of the State of Jammu and Kashmir should be based on the Delhi Agreement (Agreement envisaged excessive autonomy, bordering on sovereignty) which was arrived at in 1952 as result of discussions between the Government of India and representatives of Jammu and Kashmir state (of Kashmir alone) headed by Sheikh Abdullah, "(b)" . . .if necessary, the staff members (migrated from the valley in the wake of the ongoing secessionist militancy) who are unwilling to go back (to Kashmir) to their posts should be transferred to other regions, even on supernumerary basis and replacements provided locally." and (c) "there is no reason why over-ground spokesmen of "azadi" should not be brought on the air and asked to define what they say or claim."

Unfortunately, however, the Kashmir experts or for that

matter Prime Minister Chandrashekhar, eminent jurist, A.R. Noorani and PUCL Chief, V. Tarkunde have erred in the fashion the successive governments at the Centre have been viewing the separatist tendencies in Kashmir in isolation from the geo-political crises afflicting Jammu and Ladakh.

It is pertinent to mention that both Jammu and Ladakh have been working like a Trojan to link their destinies with those of India by severing their political truck with the egoistic and dubious Kashmir leadership. Both have been freely recognising that whatever advance they seek must be within the Union and under the Indian Constitution. In fact, slogan of a separate Jammu State within Indian Union has already gained momentum with the resolve on the part of Jammu—based political groups to launch a “war” to “stand up and resist the onslaught on their rights and opportunities” so that their progeny does not suffer and starve as “we (the people of Jammu) did all these years” of independence. The Ladakhi Buddhist Association, on the other extreme, has warned New Delhi that it would “now settle for nothing less than Union Territory status, failing which the portents for the security of the nation will not be encouraging.” Besides the overt and covert support of national parties, having their support—base in the Jammu region, the idea of a division of the State has been ably articulated by the Insaf Party Chief, Syed Shahabuddin, and the Bhartiya Jana Sangh President, Prof. Balraj Madhok.

It has to be noted that the Delhi Agreement is sought to be brought into operation for the first time in a real sense although as early as in 1952-53 the same was to be implemented, but the moves could not fructify due to the Parja Parishad Movement in Jammu in which 14 persons were killed in police firing and thousands suffered unprecedented torture in the jails. The Kashmir experts or for that matter Dr. Farooq Abdullah have sought to justify excessive autonomy to Kashmir on the basis that it is prerequisite for the preservation and promotion of “Kashmiriat”, but what they have failed to justify is its wholesale implementation in the whole

of the State and this has obviously sparked off loud protests.

Dismissing the proposals as ludicrous and highly reprehensible, it has been pointed out by the critics of the Kashmir experts that there is no point in extending the Delhi Agreement to the entire State, which, in fact, kills the spirit of the very intent. They raise the question as to why Kashmir and Jammu-Ladakh are treated alike and why they should be equated unless their idea was to "stomach insults" and "humiliations" at the hands of Kashmir leaders. Further, the experts, the intellectuals and certain top ranking political leaders are silent on how exactly are the "genuine aspirations" of the people of Jammu and Ladakh and Kashmiri Pandits to be appreciated and realized and what really is the status and role of Jammu and Ladakh in the proposed arrangement.

The shrewed and canny politicians that the Kashmiris are, they would like to further tighten their grip and, therefore, would convey the message that there was no question of New Delhi trying to interfere with the administration of the State on behalf of Jammu and Ladakh. When once the Delhi Agreement is enforced, it is asserted, Jammu and Ladakh come within the direct control of Srinagar.

The Kashmir experts perhaps feel that the matter of conferring greater autonomy as symptomatised by the Delhi Agreement, is a matter of commitment upheld by the Indian Parliament and not intended to enslave Jammu and Ladakh. Yet the fact remains that there are several ambiguities and well-founded fears which need to be removed and clarified beyond doubt so that the popularly held belief that such excessive autonomy might render Jammu & Ladakh—which comprise nine-tenth of the State area and over fifty per cent of its population—quite irrelevant for all practical purposes might be removed.

There are no two opinions on the need to institutionalise arrangements for the promotion of "Kashmiriat". Whatever might have been the compulsions under which the Delhi Agreement was signed, in the present surcharged scenario,

especially as the opinion is sharply divided on the particular course of action, it is simply prudent to search other and more acceptable alternative whereby the purpose could be served.

Regionalism does become a serious impediment in democratic processes if the policies of politico-economic development of particular area are dictated by purely partisan considerations. The question of balanced growth and equal participation at all levels right now is sweeping the political frontiers of different regions. It is, therefore, desirable and imperative to make certain that favours which stimulate egoistic parochialism are eschewed and avoided.

For the success of any move, the Central Government would be well advised to arrange a meeting at the earliest under its auspices consisting of representatives of the newly emerged political groups in Kashmir, Jammu & Ladakh and of well-meaning publicmen to diagnose the State's ailment and to suggest remedies to overcome any threat to the personality of each region. Mere tinkering would just aggravate the ailment and endanger the very existence of India as a nation. (*Daily Excelsior*, March 3, 1991)

Appendix IX

LADAKH SIGNALS A CATASTROPHE

By Dr. Hari Om

The highly sensitive and strategic Ladakh, bordering China and Pakistan, appears to be once again on the threshold of a catastrophe. But this time more united, more determined for a final do or die bid to obtain "freedom from Kashmir". The rather dangerous National Conference Congress(I) sponsored politico-communal hatred that bloodied and convulsed the peaceful Ladakhi scene in 1989 and to some extent afterwards has developed into a perfect understanding between the Buddhists-dominated Leh and the Muslim majority Kargil—thanks to the threat to the identity of Ladakh and the discriminatory policies of the State and Central Governments.

Convinced that "the problems of Kargil are the same as those of Leh and that the people of the two districts should take their future in their own hands", Akbar Ladakhi's Ladakhi Muslims Association (LMA) has thrown in its lot with Thumpstan's Ladakhi Buddhists Association (LBA), the protagonist of Union Territory status for Ladakh. Stung by what is construed as a deliberate insult compounded by Prime Minister Chandra Shekhar's failure to making Ladakh a party to the ongoing debate over the relation of Jammu· Kashmir State to India and caught between two fires or exclusiveness—the Kashmiris exclusiveness of *Kashmiriat* and the Ladakhis exclusiveness of *Ladakhiat*—the Congress leaders led by P. Namgyal, former Union Minister, have also jumped in the arena demanding "autonomous Hill Council" for Ladakh.

The only silver-lining is that unlike the Kashmir, Punjab and ULFA militants who are preaching secession from India,

the people of Ladakh favour control by New Delhi. The possibility of a threat of secession from India to China cannot, however, be completely ruled out in the event of New Delhi not taking cognizance of Thupstan Schewang's communication embodying an unambiguous warning that the LBA would "now settle for nothing less than a Union Territory status, failing which the portents for the security of the nation will not be very encouraging".

The February 14, 1991, Thupstan's unequivocal declaration in Leh at a massive public rally to revive the agitation for achieving Union territory status and the remarkable unity the cold snow-covered Himalayan District is currently witnessing is the immediate fall-out of the inordinate delay in implementing the assurances given with full solemnity by the State and Central Governments. But more than that, the Thumpstan's resolve reflects a consciousness of the danger that lay before the Ladakhis if they remained dormant and devoid of any political life and activity, of being submerged under the rising clamour for "Azadi", a befree and impartial plebiscite in Kashmir" and the "restoration of Pre-1953 political set-up", with the Centre handling only defence, Communication and Foreign Affairs.

For such a sudden development of portentous dimensions, New Delhi alone is responsible. It is tempting to recall that the LBA, which has been for quite sometime now, clamouring for Union Territory status with the sole motto of preserving Ladakh's "ethnicity and cultural identity", had called off its four-month old volatile agitation (started on July 7, 1989) following a Tripartite Agreement reached on October 29. The Agreement was signed by Thupstan, the IBA Chief, P.P. Srivastva, Additional Secretary, Union Ministry of Home Affairs, and Ashok Jaitly, Additional Chief Secretary, Jammu Kashmir Government. Buta Singh, the then Union Home Minister, had also helped in assuring the Ladakhis of modelling the region on the lines of the "Gorkhaland District-Hill Council".

The delay in implementing this Agreement and another Notification which sought to declare all the 15 tribes of Leh and Kargil as Scheduled Tribes as also the several promises held out by Mufti Mohammad Sayeed and George Fernandes, Union Ministers in the erstwhile National Front Government, has been taken by the LBA, the LMA and others as an affront. In fact, the LBA has accused the Mufti and other "Kashmiri vested interests in the bureaucracy" of sabotaging the Tripartite Agreement and the Notification.

New Delhi should not view the secessionist militancy in Kashmir in isolation from the geo-political crisis afflicting Ladakh or for that matter in Jammu where a movement for a separate Jammu State is on. Each of the three regions of the State-Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh-has its own distinct identity and personality. Colossal tragedy in Kashmir cannot be an excuse for ignoring legitimate politico-economic aspirations of and the serious political developments and agitational activities going on below and over the surface in both Jammu and Ladakh, rife with sub-nationalism ever since independence.

It is indeed an irony that New Delhi is so eager to please and conciliate the Kashmiri militants whose watchword is "Azadi" and methodology AK-47, Rocket Launcher, kidnapping and brutal killing, but is totally cold and indifferent towards Jammu and Ladakh whose battle-cry is complete integration with India and *modus operani* essentially constitutional.

One thing is clear after analysing the developments in the state after January 1, 1991, and after sifting the pages containing the LBA resolutions and statements. This is that a catastrophe is in the offing and what that catastrophe would be cannot be in doubt. Already, according to the Leh's Development Commissioner Samual Verghese, "every Buddhist employee in the Government" has "joined the agitation and stopped working".

The catastrophe can still be averted. An earnest effort

must be made to find out lasting solutions to the issues facing Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh. But the effort can succeed only if New Delhi can be persuaded to face the reality of the situation. The reality is that Jammu and Ladakh have been grossly neglected and Kashmir unduly pampered. This is the direct result of the political bankruptcy and lack of a perspective. The best New Delhi can hope for is a compromise which does not amount to the trifurcation of the State. The accusations in Jammu and Ladakh that Srinagar and New Delhi have done nothing to serve their cause are not preposterous and silly.

The only option available to salvage Jammu and Ladakh's pride lies in their political empowerment and solution to the Kashmir imbroglio in realistic and firm policy and in holding free and fair elections so that the Kashmiris could secure selection of leaders of the class by whom they desire to be represented. Clamour for "Azadi" or for a free and impartial plebiscite should not be taken lightly. The clamours are an index of the powerful clout the pro-Pakistan secessionists enjoy in Kashmir. India would be booked for a further crisis if the process of rot is not halted forthwith. (*Daily Excelsior*, March 4, 1991)

Appendix X

PRESIDENT'S JAMMU VISIT DIABOLICAL CONGRESS(I)—NC GAME EXPOSED

By Dr. Hari Om

The Congress(I) has once again played foul with the humiliated Jammu. Mangat Ram Sharma's two meetings with the President of India, R. Venkataraman, at Jammu, on April 6 and 7, 1991, only served to highlight the sheer opportunism and political bankruptcy of the Congress(I), ever busy with power games unrelated to people's aspirations, needs and problems. Instead of acquainting the President with the Jammu's woes and suggesting a realistic perception based on the traumatic experiences spreading over four decades with the equality of Jammu and Ladakh with Kashmir in all spheres as also politico-constitutional status for Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh at par with the other States of the Indian Union as the hallmarks, the Congress (I) delegation led by Mangat Ram Sharma simply sought to scuttal the moves aimed at initiating the much-needed and the much-talked about political process in the strife-torn State through democratic means and electoral politics.

How else can one explain the Congress(I) suggestions: "save the State from the trauma of elections" and "revive the dissolved legislative assembly"—the assembly constituted in 1987 through wholesale rigging which deprived the genuine political dissent in the Valley symbolised by the Muslim United Front of its due in the political process. The demand for the revival of the dissolved assembly and the maniacal opposition to the holding of elections to the assembly and Lok Sabha only bespeaks the Congress diabolical game streaked with the impatient desire for instant gratification through

backdoor (Advisory Councils or revived Assembly).

The attitude of the self-appointed Jammu leaders of the National Conference (NC) was equally reprehensible and deplorable. They had the audacity of pleading with the President of India for a "soft approach" on Kashmir with the upshot of their argument "Kashmiris need love not suppression", but had no word to project the enslaved Jammu which has become a playground for self-seekers and unscrupulous politicians drawing inspiration from and obeying the dictates of their Delhi-based Kashmiri masters who are frantically seeking asylum in Delhi, Bombay and foreign lands instead of politically resisting and countering the militants' onslaught there in the Valley itself.

In fact, the Congress (I) and the NC were guilty of unforgivable frivolity and political irresponsibility in the choice they had made of the issue of elections and the timing of the manoeuvre to ditch the people of Jammu and Ladakh anxiously waiting for participation in the election process to choose representatives of their choice. One can easily understand the helplessness, the fear and the nervousness of the rejected and the redundant NC. But one surely fails to comprehend why the Congress(I), which has all the stakes in Jammu, and Ladakh, is allowing itself to be trapped by the marginal Farooq Abdullah whose new abode is London. Having no appreciation of the gravity of the ills afflicting Jammu, the Congress(I) is just making itself redundant.

It would be no exaggeration to opine that there are no more solid vote banks, no more platforms, and no new catchy slogans available to the Congress(I). Its leaders are sure to face hostile Jammuise seething with anger who has watched their antics, their unethical backroom manoeuvrings, their shameless horsetrading, but, above all, the betrayal of the public faith, with growing disgust. It has been rightly observed that the Congress (I), today, is like a "train in the process of shunting. Crawling forwards and backwards, and occasionally sending shivers along the couplings, all in all never in

predictable motion, and, therefore adding to the traffic jam on all sides". In short, with its intellectual incapacity to formulate a strategy for the future, the Congress(I) is slowly but steadily bringing the State's polity to a grinding halt.

Surprisingly the political behaviour of the Janta Dal (JD) leaders displayed during their meeting with the President of India on April 6 or at the press conference in New Delhi on April 7 was less ambivalent, less opportunistic. Flaying the unholy Rajiv-Farooq nexus, the JD leaders warned that "denial of participation to the populace of the State in the coming parliamentary snappoll may prove dangerous in the long run". (Rajiv still needs Farooq in the rest of the country to garner Muslim votes in favour of the Congress(I). Farooq still needs Rajiv to sabotage the possibility of elections in the State as long as possible as also to obtain a parliamentary constituency outside the State for Saif-Ud-Din Soz whose antecedents are too well known.) The JD leaders not only condemned Rajiv and Farooq who have "set the Valley afire due to their inaptitude" but also posed a pointed question: "If these (elections) cannot be held in the whole State, why not in Jammu and Ladakh... free from the menace of terrorists". The attitude of the JD(S) too was identical.

However, it was the Bhartiya Janta Party (BJP) which submitted a comprehensive four-page memorandum to the President of India charting the party's perception on Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh. Expressing deep concern and dismay over the casual manner the issues listed in the November 5, 1988, document submitted to the President during his last visit to Jammu were dealt with, the BJP Vice-President, Radha Kishan Sharma, re-emphasised the supreme importance of considering the "vital issues" the memorandum embodies with the seriousness they deserve.

On reflection, one might say that there are four major issues the BJP wants the President of India to evaluate dispassionately and urgently. All other issues can be subsumed

in these four and from there, four political solutions also follow. These four issues are :

- (1) report on Kashmir by the "so-called Kashmir experts",
- (2) "efficacy of the full-merger approach",
- (3) Regional Councils for Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh, and
- (4) objective and impartial delimitation of the assembly and Lok Sabha constituencies. Apart from these four principal issues, the BJP's stress is on holding elections in Jammu and Ladakh.

Reflecting on the Qasim-Nayar-Dave-Dhar and Mukherjee's report on Kashmir which, inter-alia, suggests a politico-constitutional relationship of J & K with the Indian Union based on the 1952 Delhi Agreement under which New Delhi had jurisdiction only over Defence, Foreign Affairs and Communications to "end alienation" of "Kashmiri Muslims", Radha Kishan Sharma declared it to be "ghastly and alarming". The BJP reaction to the proposals for solving the Kashmir tangle can be gauged from the memorandum which reads : "It is a preposterous proposal aimed at undoing all that has been done by way of effecting the increased integration of the State with the Union by a number of constitutional measures since after 1953 . . . These dangerous proposals" be "rejected with the contempt they deserve . . . It would be nothing more than a pathological obsession to give exclusive importance to Kashmir and Kashmiriat in the search for a solution . . . The political aspirations of Jammu and Ladakh . . . have prior claim . . . They will not brook any separatist status for the State. They will not tolerate the political will of the minority in the Valley being thrust on Jammu and Ladakh" and "the so-called 'experts' proposals is a mischief package and will lead to the State's secession from India".

Lambasting the So-called experts which included former Chief Minister, former State Chief Secretaries, an eminent

journalist and a former Principal Secretary to the Prime Minister, and terming their report as "ridiculous" seeking "a reversal of the Kashmir policy in force since after Sheikh Abdullah's arrest in 1953", the BJP memorandum commended "the popular support of the people of Kashmir for India" and the 1953-75 approach which successfully contained subversion in the Valley and foiled Pakistan's nefarious design of annexing Kashmir through full-fledged wars in 1965 and 1971. Vindicating the efficacy of the integrationist approach which was in operation between 1953 and 75, Radha Kishan Sharma exhibited surprise over the suggested revival of the pre-1953 separatist approach which has enabled Pakistan to "create a serious threat to the unity of India in Kashmir by a proxy war being fought on the shoulders of the Kashmiris alienated as a result of the post-1975 Congress approach."

As a matter of fact, the BJP urged the President of India to cry halt to the Nehruvian approach recognising the irreparable damage it has done to the "national good" and "revert to the one which paid handsome dividends during 1953-75". What could have been a more vociferous and massive testimony to the ills of the Congress pseudo-secularism "and what could have been a more biting sarcasm than that the the BJP Vice President should request the President of India "to spare some moments to visit the camps, where the hapless migrants (in their own motherland) from the Valley reside in a make-do manner".

The third and fourth crucial issues about which the BJP memorandum gave an unmistakable impression relate to Jammu and Ladakh seething with anger due to the "phenomenon of monumental imbalances" in all spheres and frustrated on being let down by the Congress-NC-New Delhi combination right from 1947. The BJP, in fact, took all the powers that be whether in New Delhi or in Srinagar including the present State Governor and President of India to task and ably articulated the nature and implications of gross-discrimination and unprecedented bias against Jammu and Ladakh.

Demanding justice for Jammu and Ladakh in matters relating to delimitation of the assembly and Lok Sabha constituencies, representation in the assembly, Lak Sabha and State services, allocation of funds, developmental schemes, selection of candidates for the professional and technical institutions and creation of new districts etc., to mention a few, the BJP suggested that "as an institutional arrangement", Regional Councils be established in Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh forthwith, failing which the "unfortunate process of alienation in Jammu and Ladakh" would doubtlessly develop into militancy. It would be, According to the BJP, nothing but political illiteracy and height of irresponsibility to furt her ignore Jammu and Ladakh "out and out for merger of the State with the Union".

If these four issues account for all or nearly all the troubles, the following four solutions have to be attempted to eliminate the basic causes and root out the problems altogether.

- (a) Throwing away lock, stock and barrel the Congress model of secularism which has only appeased the separatists and anti-national elements and created the present mess.
- (b) A new realistic Kashmir policy be adopted to fully integrate Jammu and Kashmir with the other States of the Union by the abrogation of Article 370 of the Indian Constitution.
- (c) Scrapping of 'Kashmir experts' report.
- (d) Reconstitution of the Delimitation Commission by nominating "popular and genuine" representatives and the creation of the Regional Councils in Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh.

It is certainly vain to expect from those in power any change for the better. The people can, however, through conscious and diligent use of their absolute power can bring about a qualitative change in the State polity for the betterment.

The time has come when the people of Jammu and Ladakh have to discard with contempt those who have utter disregard for social service and regard for allurements of power and pelf. They must come forward to encourage those who have adequate maturity for public dealings and reject those who are skilful in exploiting their innocence and faith. (*Daily Exelsior*, April 15, 1991)

Appendix XI

JAMMU IDENTITY, AUTONOMY AND STATEHOOD

By Balraj Puri

National Front Government at the Centre marked the end of what many people in Jammu used to call Kashmiri Raj. Since January, 1990, the State has been ruled by a Governor who is nominee of the Government of India. At the higher level of administration which used to be dominated by Kashmiri Muslims, their representation became nominal. Posts of Advisors, Chief Secretary, DG Police and 10 out of 11 Additional Chief Secretaries are held by non-Kashmiri Muslims. The such hated tribe of politicians also lost their authority.

As major parties like the National Conference and the Congress went to hibernation, the BJP acquired larger than life stature. It not only dominated the local administration but also had a lot of clout with the Centre. As it was based in Jammu and the State unit was led by Jammn leadership, it became the main medium of access to power for the people of the region.

With these apparently favourable factors, this should have been a period of maximum tranquility, unity and harmony in the region. A contented Jammu should have been a source of strength for the new regime which could devote its entire attention to meeting the secessionist—militant challenge in Kashmir without being distracted.

However, Jammu had in this year its more than normal quote of *dharnas*, hunger strikes, *bandhs*, police-mob clashes,

firings, students revolt, curfew and unprecedented incident of self-immolation, which clearly demonstrated that Jammu was far from contented. In fact, it felt more insecure about its identity than ever before.

True, a part of the unrest in Jammu was due to outside factors. But most of the agitations were on local issues too. Even, on outside issues, region's reponse was far from disciplined and mature. It is obvious that patriotic sentiments of the people could not be harnessed by the new regime.

That the bureaucrats imported from Delhi had as little knowledge and appreciation of the aspirations, problems and mind of the region as the Kashmiri leaders used to have goes without saying. But the problem is more due to the limitations of the system than to those of the individuals who are running it.

Urge for identity and power are the basic human urges in the modern time, without which no people can be satisfied. The search for solution of Jammu's problem in terms of the change of rulers and transfer of power from Srinagar to New Delhi which is implied in the demands for abrogation of Article 370 and imposition of president's rule therefore proved illusory.

My campaign since independence for recognition of Jammu's identity and empowerment of its people at regional, district, block and panchayat levels was part of my belief that this would lead to harmonious inter-regional relations which would in turn lead to the whole state becoming a more contented part of the nation.

The leadership of the BJP and its previous incarnations of Jan Sangh and Praja Parishad subjected me to a campaign of vilification and dubbed my demand for regional autonomy as anti-national.

However, Rishi Kumar Kaushal had the grace and greatness to admit at a meeting that my only fault was I could

think forty years ahead and that he would publicly apologise for having condemned me for raising this demand.

By now there is universal recognition in Jammu, including among the ranks of the BJP, that identity and power are basic needs of Jammu. The local unit of the party is believed to have gone to the extent of demanding statehood for the region but was dissuaded by . . . its national leadership to refrain from it, though the demand is being raised through other forums.

The dilemma of the BJP is that it is trying to play two contradictory roles; as a champion of Jammu and as a Champion of Hindutava. It is on account of demographic composition of the region that in spite of riding on a Hindutava wave, it would not save its security and get a majority in a single assembly segment of Jammu region during the last Lok Sabha poll.

In the current debate on the problems of Jammu my role has been commented upon in certain statements, articles and letters to the editor. It is neither possible nor necessary for me to react to all such comments. Do I need to defend myself against attacks on my patriotism, integrity and motives? A correspondent in a local paper for instance condemned me for raising the bogey of regional autonomy to get benefits from successive regimes of the State. I do not have to catalogue how much I have suffered at the hands of each successive regime precisely on account of my stand on the issue. For I want my views to be considered on their merit and not on the basis of what price I have paid for them.

I, however, respect genuine difference of opinion. Raman Kumar Gardish, for instance, in his well written letter (K.T. 24.7.1990) argues that my prescription for a five tier set up is no more acceptable. The formula of regional autonomy, according to him, was sabotaged by the Kashmir leadership. He wants me to be the torch bearer for the demand of a separate state of Jammu.

Though I could not respond to this letter directly, I had

explained my reservations about the division of the State in my article in the *Times of India* (13.8.1990) and my views on the identity and autonomy of Jammu in an article in *Hindustan Times* (6.7.1990).

Let me briefly state my position on these points again. Firstly, various tiers of autonomy would give a sense of participation to people at all levels, and this ensure unity in a diverse region like Jammu. Secondly, whatever be the intention of Kashmir leadership, its offers of regional autonomy were always rejected by those who claimed to be the leaders of Jammu or of its Hindu population. At any rate they provided an alibi to the Kashmir leadership to wriggle out of its commitments.

Autonomy or statehood is not an objective in itself. The objective is to maintain and strengthen the identity of Jammu. At a time when Kashmir and Ladakh have almost been completely polarised on communal lines, our foremost concern should be to avoid such polarisation in Jammu and preserve its unity and identity.

I have explained in my *Times of India* article that Pakistan's main objective in Kashmir, for the time being, is to carve out a Muslim fundamentalist pocket within India. I have cited some evidence to show that America is helping Pakistan to achieve this objective. They are working through Muslim and Hindu fundamentalists, respectively, for the purpose. The latter, I believe, are unwitting instruments of the game.

My fear is that the slogan of statehood for Jammu, which ironically became vocal after the end of the Kashmiri Raj, may help the foreign powers to divide Jammu. I have faith in the patriotism and rationality of voters of Statehood and hope that they would keep my fears in mind.

I have not come across their literature on the subject, except scores of writings of my friend Dr. Hari Om that the three regions are culturally, historically and geographically distinct is a valid enough argument against the present set up.

But by using political, ideological and philosophical differences between the regions as an argument for separate statehood, he adds confusion to its concept from which it is difficult to rescue its case (K. T. 22.8.1990).

He argues that while the national parties like the Congress, the BJP and the Janata Dal are being rejected by the Kashmiris, the NC is being looked down upon by the Jammuites and Ladakhis. Firstly, it is an oversimplified statement NC is perhaps more categorically rejected today in Kashmir than in other two regions. While the NC candidates did not get more than 5% votes in the valley in the last parliamentary elections, the successful candidate from Ladakh, where voters fully participated, was NC supported independent. Again, its candidate has got more votes than BJP supported Karan Singh in Jammu in the earlier election.

Secondly, while there is no doubt that the NC has been essentially a party of Kashmiri nationalism, national parties have proved equally inadequate to represent aspirations of the other two regions as also of Kashmir.

In any case, if the states were to be formed on the basis of ideological and party affiliations of the people Marxists, socialists, Gandhians and others as also Congress, Janata Dal and BJP would be entitled to have States of their own.

Similarly Hari Om's argument that unlike Kashmir Jammu and Ladakh advocate and welcome central laws is sweeping. Did he and entire Jammu accept Mandal, for instance.

I am amused to learn from Hari Om that he rescued me from a certain physical assault in the coffee house. All I know about the incident he has referred to is that after I spoke on Jammu's response to Kashmir problem, a handful of Kashmiri Pandits put some irrelevant questions. On being snubbed by the rest of the audience, they walked out. As I passed through them, after the meeting, they raised a slogan against me on which they were rebuked by others and silenced.

That group of KP's might have been angry with me. But I never imagined that they were goondas bent upon an assault on me as Hari Om implies.

Anyhow, how does this incident make out a case for a separate statehood for Jammu? The argument is that Jammu and Kashmir are divided on the question of human rights of which I am supposed to be the champion. But the fact that some Kashmiris at the meeting opposed human rights while a Jammu man supported it does not corroborate the argument. Moreover, human right movement has a prestigious status in India. Does Hari Om make out a case for Jammu's secession from India?

Hari Om repeatedly brackets Jammu and Ladakh to highlight their differences with Kashmir, ignoring cultural, linguistic, geographical and historical differences between the first two regions. He hails historical role of BJP in bringing together Jammu, Kashmiri Pandits and Ladakhi Buddhists. As Buddhists are not much more than half of Ladakh's population and the BJP following in Jammu is confined to a section of Hindus, the tripple union excludes Muslims of Jammu as well as Ladakh.

By isolating and forcing these non-Kashmiri Muslim communities to join with Kashmiri Muslims as one entity, the Pak-America game, I referred to above, to consolidate a Muslim block would be facilitates.

I know the support Hari Om's formulations are getting from Muslim fundamentalists. But I am opposed to it because it would kill the spirit of *Kashmiriat* and its ancient heritage and identify, (b) reduce Muslim parts of Jammu and Ladakh to satellites of the valley and curb their ethnic aspirations, (c) break Jammu's identity and its secular basis.

It is far from me to suggest that the BJP and Hari Om are consciously playing a foreign game. Though in another context he called my role as anti-national and gave a call of social boycott of persons like me. I have no reason to suspect

his patriotism.

Space and time do not permit me to deal with scores of points the prolific writer has raised. But basically he conceives Jammu State on the basis of ideological and political conformity in which there would be no room for dissent and human rights. Perhaps he has not realized that these are characteristics of a fascist State. He also tends to treat Jammu as synonymous with Hindus who are closer to Pandits of Kashmir and Buddhists of Ladakh. I have no less respect for the aspirations and interests of KPs and Buddhists. But in the context of Statehood or autonomy for Jammu, Non-Hindu communities of the region are more relevant.

I have submitted implications of some of Hari Om's formulations, which might have escaped his notice in his zeal and passion, for his consideration and possible rethinking. Those who believe that statehood alone can guarantee Jammu's identity and interest must also accept his challenge to the very basis of this belief.¹

1. Kashmir Times, No ember 19, 1990.

Appendix XII

DEBATE ON JAMMU STATEHOOD

By Balraj Puri

My article on Jammu identity, autonomy and Statehood (K.T. November, 19) perhaps got more notice than it deserved. A nicely written article by Dr. Virendra Gupta spelling out a case for a separate Jammu state was preceded and followed by a number of letters of academicians, commenting on my article.

It may further be a matter of personal satisfaction for me to find that most of the arguments used in these writings are, with or without quoting me, almost the same that I have used all these years for recognition of Jammu's identity and empowerment of its people. In fact by now they form the main idiom of all discussions on Jammu problem. As one of the first persons in the country to propound the theory of identity, I should feel vindicated.

Then the catalogue of Jammu's grievances used in the debate on my article, too, is familiar and oft-repeated. I could draw a much longer catalogue. Even if all these grievances are removed, my case for regional identities stands. For every distinct cultural and geographical unit has a right to preserve its identity and autonomy. I am sick of the argument that Jammu has been getting step motherly treatment by Kashmiri leaders. For I never regarded them as my mother. I have often used the analogy of three sisters for the three regions who should have a relation of equility and friendship with one another. I am as much a champion of the identity of Jammu as of Kashmir and Ladakh.

I am also glad that some of these writings have conceded

intra-regional diversities and provided for four tier system within the region which I had suggested to the Gajendra-gadkar Commission and for which I had prepared a constitutional draft.

However, what I fail to understand is what is it that provoked a number of letter writers, repeating more or less the same arguments and language, to criticise my article.

They have all tried to rebut my alleged charge that the demand for Jammu statehood is communal.

I have had not said a word for or against statehood and nowhere characterised it as communal or otherwise in the said article. All arguments on my behalf have been invented in a manner to make them a convenient target. I am amazed at the capacity of my critics to distort my arguments. But Prof. K.L. Bhatia has beaten even them in his distortion when he attributes to me a perception that Ladakh is for Buddhists, Kashmir for Kashmiri Muslims and Jammu for Jammuite Hindus. I have debunked this theory in this as well as in many of previous writings. Again, how could he put words in my mouth that I portray Jammuites as communal frenzy having almost pioneered the concept?

I just wonder if I had really criticised concept of statehood or the role of the Mukti Morcha, which I had not done in the impugned article but which I reserve the right to do, what would have been the reaction of my friends.

My article was not intended to be a discussion on statehood as such. I referred to it in only two contexts. Firstly, I had, expressing my faith in patriotism and rationality of voteries of statehood, hoped that they would keep in mind my fear that some foreign powers who were bent upon dividing Jammu may use their idea.

I do have evidence of the game of foreign powers I referred to. If I draw the attention of the patriots of Jammu to that game, did it deserve consideration or condemnation?

Secondly, without making any comments of my own on the idea of the statehood, I had urged those who believe that statehood alone can guarantee identity and interest must accept challenge of Hari Om to the very basis of this belief.

I had also submitted implications of Hari Om's formulations which might have escaped his notice in his zeal and passion for his consideration.

Neither Hari Om thought my submissions worthy of consideration nor other supporters of statehood accepted my suggestion of rescuing the concept of Jammu's unity and identity from what it seemed to me the onslaught of Hari Om.

I may be wrong in my understanding of Hari Om. It was for him to clarify his views or if he was open minded enough to correct them. He could point out any mistake in my interpretation of his views. I would have readily made necessary amends. But he preferred to entire the debate through proxy. His friends perhaps considered it their friendly duty to rush to his rescue believing in the policy that attack is the best defence. I mind neither the proxy debate nor the attack, provided it had anything to do with even a single point that I had raised in my piece.

My contention is that Jammu identity, whatever form it may take, is based on its geography and culture. If states are to be formed on the basis of political ideology of the people, as Hari Om argues, their boundaries will have to be changed after every election. Further there should be room in a democratic system for more than one political views in one State. Otherwise present political differences between bulk of the two major communities of Kashmir would, for instance, imply that the minority has no right to be a part of the Kashmiri identity as some of the militant groups might maintain. (That the situation in Kashmir may not permit to return at the moment is another matter).

Similarly, political developments might have driven

Kashmiri Pandits, Ladakhi Buddhists Association and the BJP closer to one another. But while hailing their unity, as a historic and memorable event, Hari Om does not consider its implication for Jammu's identity. For Jammu is not merely Hindu and all Hindus are not BJP. Jammu still has time to avoid the split that has taken place in the identity of Kashmir and Ladakh, in its own interest as well as in the interest of repairing the damage to the identities of the other two regions. This suggestion, too, does not amount to characterisation of demand for separate statehood as communal and, in any case, is not so outrageous as to offend the susceptibilities of those who sought to defend Hari Om.

Out of a long list of arguments Hari Om used for statehood of Jammu one is that of my supposed unpopularity in Jammu for my views on human rights. Why did not correspondents in the debate enlighten me the logic of the argument, irrespective of whatever be the degree of my popularity or unpopularity and whether I am right or wrong?

I have not discussed the fate of minorities in the proposed Jammu State and its communal or secular character though my critics has assumed it and taken me to task for it. But the call for my social boycott given by Hari Om for my alleged anti-national views raises a more basic question of the fight of what I regard the most sacred minority i.e. minority of one in the new state he has in mind; even if he is as unpopular as I am supposed to be.

By no stretch of imagination my comments on views of Hari Om can be construed as my criticism of the concept of statehood for Jammu even if he is considered synonymous with it. I had simply drawn his attention and that of believers in statehood, to what he had said and sought clarification of that for my enlightenment. If they did not think I was entitled to do so. I could be ignored. But how could those who took up cudgils on his behalf put me in the dock asking in my explanation for what I never said while not touching issues raised by me.

I have been asked by more than one persons why movement for autonomy failed. I do not know what is the measure of failure and success they are using. But a few facts should be kept in mind while evaluating what it could achieve. It got categorical support from national leaders like Jawaharlal Nehru and Jayaprakash Narayan as also from the national press. The movement for autonomy forced the government to appoint Gajendragadkar Commission. Practically every chief minister, before and after coming to power, committed to implement it—Sheikh Abdullah offered to appoint a commission to work out its details. Farooq Abdullah announced a similar commission under my chairmanship.

You may doubt the intentions of Kashmiri leaders if you like but every time it was the so called Jammu leadership which provided them the excuse to wriggle out of their commitment. Why do not those who talk of my failure have a word of criticism of those who had always sabotaged it?

The idea of regional autonomy had received a rare consensus among all sections of people of Jammu & Ladakh and was endorsed by the entire political spectrum of Kashmir assembled at the J & K People's Convention at Srinagar conveyed by Sheikh Abdullah.

Mass movement were launched in Jammu in 1978-79 and Ladakh in 1980. Those who sabotaged Jammu movement need hardly be identified.

The movement for regional autonomy did not achieve more success it is less due to the merit of the idea than to my and my colleague's limitations. While all the national parties opposed it and official machinery and resources used to character assassinate me, the movement was after all led by an ordinary person called Balraj Puri who was without charisma, without a formal status, without resources and without qualifications of a great leader.

Those who have any personal allergy to my person or are

convinced of my weakness may write me off but they need not start from entirely a clean slate and may not entirely write off whatever work has been done for recognition of Jammu identity and urge for its autonomy?

In any case I am not all rigid about it and would consider any alternative with an open mind.

There indeed would be a frank debate on the future set up of the State and possible options for Jammu. I am certainly interested in contributing my mite to it. But what worries me is the wide communication gap between me and other participants in the present debate on my article. I wonder whether my expression is so poor or the imagination of my critics is so fertile that they can take note of what I have not said but do not notice what I said with the result that the debate has not at all helped in narrowing down the differences and promoting understanding.

The situation is too grave to permit such a lapse on our part. It is nothing short of a calamity for a community if it loses capacity for a dialogue.¹

1. *Kashmir Times*, Jammu, December 12, 1990.

Appendix XIII

JAMMU'S IDENTITY, AUTONOMY AND STATEHOOD

By Prof. M.L. Kapur

A very useful debate has recently started in these columns on the above noted subject and a number of intellectuals have expressed their views.

The ongoing debate on the subject, "says, Dr. Hari Om, is expected to clinch the issue." (KT. Dec 18). It is precisely with a view to facilitating this task that the present article has been written.

The problem :

All those who have participated in the debate say with one accord that, since independence, the Jammu region and Ladakh have been neglected and discriminated against Kashmir by both the State Govt. controlled by the Kashmiri leadership and the Centre. Dr. Virender Gupta has listed some points of discrimination (KT Dec. 5) Mr. Balraj Puri says that he "could draw a much longer catalogue" (KT. Dec. 12), and Dr. Hari Om has indeed indentified more in his writings.

Why were these regions subjected to discrimination and neglect? If I have correctly understood what Prof. K.L. Bhatia says, the Centre cared more for Kashmir and Kashmir was able to ignore Jammu and Ladakh because of the Damocles sword of accession (KT Dec. 4). There is then the "Bridge theory". According to it, the overwhelmingly Muslim populated Kashmir could be brought and kept in the national mainstream only if Jammu and Ladakh, where non-Muslims

predominated, did not claim their due, and gave a carte blanche to the former (KT. Dec. 5). In simple language, this might be described as a policy of appeasement towards the Muslims of Kashmir in the national interest.

Now the scenario has undergone a sea change. Writer after writer has well argued that neither of the above mentioned reasons stands valid any more. Not only that. Earlier it were the people of Kashmir who were condemning the Treaty of Amritsar of 1846 vide which Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh were united to form one State under Maharaja Gulab Singh. Now, those of Jammu also have begun to criticise it, though from a different angle. Prof. K.L. Bhatia and Dr. Virender Gupta call the formation of the State under the Treaty as an "accident of history". (KT Dec. 4,5) implying it was unwise. But both agree that the State was brought into existence under a well considered plan by the then Govt. of India for a definite purpose. Keeping in view those times, therefore, the measure was a historical necessity and not as "accident".

But after independence, the rationale of keeping together the historically, geographically, culturally and ethnically diverse regions of Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh had ceased to exist. A new relationship had to be devised if, to use the words of Prof. Bhatia "the present heterogeneous conglomeration known as Jammu and Kashmir State (KT. Dec. 4) was still to be retained as one administrative & political entity. That was the new historical necessity. But unfortunately it was not realised by any one then, and the old set-up was allowed to continue to the detriment of all-Jammu, Kashmir, Ladakh, and India as a whole. There is a complete unanimity of views of all the participants in the debate on this point. Dr. Virender aptly sums it up when he says, "Union of Jammu with Kashmir has become counter-productive" (KT. Dec. 5), but after 1947.

The solutions :

What should be done now? The debate has so far thrown

up two solutions. The one is the trifurcation of the State and the second is internal autonomy of the three regions within the State.

Before expressing my views on these solutions, I would like to be very clear about the end which is sought to be achieved through these means. Prof. Bhatia wants that "the policy makers must devise some mechanism where by Jammuites freed from the indifferent and insensitive Kashmiri leadership. "(KT. Dec. 4). Dr. Virender says almost the same thing but more explicitly. To quote him, "Basic problem of Jammu is that it has been denied free and fair participation in the political structure of Jammu & Kashmir State, Discrimination against Jammu in services, development, allocation of funds follows from this political neglect and discrimination." (KT Dec. 8). According to them, therefore, our objective is to get our due share in power and thereby put a stop to the discrimination at the hands of the Kashmiri leadership. Balraj Puri too demands power for Jammu for the same reasons as well as for the preservation of our identity. He writes, "urget for identity and power are the basic human urges in the modern times, without which no people can be satisfied." (KT. Nov. 19; Dec. 11). Dr. Virender also gives due importance to the identity factor at another place (KT Dec. 5). There is also a consensus among all that the basis of Jammu identity as such is cultural and geographical.

In the light of these objectives, let us now examine the arguments put forth for or against the two solutions. According to Dr. Virender, "the interests, aspirations and the needs of these regions are conflicting and mutually exclusive", (KT. Dec. 5). Explaining the exclusiveness in some details, Dr. Hari Om lays great stress on a few contradictions between Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh. Considering these as inherent, he cites among others, notably the attitude of the three regions towards the accession to and integration with India, besides different heroes and sources of history. Hence, he argues that "to keep together such people under a single state must lead to a growing discontent and ultimate destruction of any

system that must be so built for the government of such state. "Therefore", Says Dr. Virender", unless separate assembly, separate cabinet and Chief Minister are not worked out for Jammu region, the political aspirations of the people of Jammu cannot be fulfilled" (KT. Dec. 8).

Giving an outline of the separate state of Jammu, Dr. Virender further says, "a four-tier system; State, district, block and panchyat is suggested. Decentralisation of powers along these four units is envisaged in the constitution of a separate Jammu State. This shall ensure harmonious inter-district relations, equal participation of all sections of people at political, social and economic level. In the proposed Jammu state arrangements for the preservation of sub-cultural identities and equal development of all the areas falling within the State will be guaranteed. This type of system shall not only fulfil the basic urge for identity and power of the people of various areas but shall do away with the apprehensions, if any, among the minorities residing in the Jammu region." Inter-regional relations also are expected to become healthier since "the separate states will eliminate the role of religious regional appeals in politics because the Kashmiries will have then to contend with wooing the Kashmiri electorate and the Jammu politicians, the people of Jammu region alone." (KT. Dec. 5, 8).

Whatever we know so far about the regional autonomy plan has come down to us from the pen of Mr. Balraj Puri. He envisages the devolution of power from the State-level down to the regional district, block and panchayat levels—a five-tier system, in other words. This plan, he says, "would give sense of participation to people at all levels and thus ensure unity in a diverse region like Jammu" (KT. Nov. 19) and also "leads to harmonious inter-regional relations which in turn would lead to the whole state becoming a more contented part of the nation." (KT. Dec. 11).

The readers would note that the protagonists of both the trifurcation of the state and the regional autonomy argue that

their plan would promote inter-regional as well as inter-district harmony. That, is, both the plans would lead us to our goal.

However, a great confusion has arisen on account of some observations of Mr. Balraj Puri. In the first instance, he is against the division of the State on communal lines and lists the bad consequences of it (KT. Dec. 11). Secondly, he is all for avoiding it. Hence, he says, "At a time when Kashmir and Ladakh" have almost been completely polarised on communal lines, our foremost concern should be to avoid such polarisation in Jammu and preserve its unity and identity" (KT November 19). Thirdly, he claims to possess some evidence of an American game to help Pakistan in carving out a Muslim fundamentalist pocket within India, and expresses his fear, and only fear that "the slogan of statehood for Jammu, May help the foreign powers to divide Jammu" on communal lines and thereby facilitate their objective (KT. Dec. 11, 12).

I would like to make some comments on these observations. First, I fail to understand how can it be said that Mr. Balraj Puri has labled the demand for separate Jammu state as communal. Secondly, if anybody does so, the demands for regional autonomy too would have to be characterised as communal because, as I would show later on practically there is little to distinguish one from the other. Thirdly, I find that Balraj Puri and the champions of separate state are of one mind in this respect. To quote Dr. Virender, "We have deep conviction that sub-identities, whether there are cultural, communal or caste based should not only be protected but should be given equal opportunities of development within the proposed Jammu State" (KT. Dec. 8). Lastly, all of us would certainly like to be on the watch against any game to divide us on communal lines.

❦

The preferred one :

If then both the solutions lead us to the same goal, why is the one preferred to other, or, why and where is the clash-between the two? while accounting for the failure of the auto-

nomy idea as propagated by Balraj Puri to catch the imagination of a large section of the Jammuites in the past, Dr. Virender says, "One of the reasons in my view is its impracticability and not giving proper guarantee for removing political deprivation of the people of Jammu." (KT Dec. 8). Nevertheless, he feels that given the will, it can be implemented. To quote him again, "experience has, however, shown that this solution cannot be practically implemented so long as political will is not there" (KT Dec. 5).

So if we go by this reasoning, even regional autonomy can solve our problem provided it enshrines safeguards against discrimination and provided further political will is there to implement it sincerely and properly. And it should not be difficult to work out the details of the autonomy plan in such a way that these ends are achieved. To me, therefore, Mr. Naresh Kumar Gupta appears very much near the truth when he says, "there is no basic difference and contradiction" between the arguments for both the solutions (KT Nov. 24).

The contradictions between the three regions as pointed out by Dr. Hari Om are undoubtedly there for anyone to see. But the important ones among them have developed, as Dr. Om also knows, over the years because of the wrong perspectives and policies of both the central and the State governments. My conviction is that these can be removed if a sincere attempt is made.

In this connection, I would further like to submit that though the present political and administrative set-up, has worked in favour of Kashmir, yet the man in the streets of the valley has been little benefitted by it. No wonder, his ire is directed as much against the corrupt leadership of Kashmir as it is against Delhi. The need of the hour is, therefore, to carry the masses of Kashmir also along with us while sorting out our problem. And my fervent appeal to the people of Kashmir is to join us in search for a place of honour for each of three regions in India as well as for each sub-division in a region.

To conclude, may I earnestly hope that my submissions would receive due consideration at the hands of all the well-wishers of the state. Regional autonomy is easier for us to achieve and for the Govt. of India to concede. It would also offer a model to the other states which are beset with problems similar to us and thereby check the fissiparous tendencies likely to be generated by the formation of small states. After all, there is the difference of but one step or tier in the two solutions under discussion. Let this tier form a bond of brotherhood between the otherwise three diverse regions. Let us separate, but separate like three brothers who have their separate kitchens but continue to live in one house. Let us formulate a new political and administrative set-up for our state on the lines of a federation in which the tier at the top deals with some selected subjects only which concern the state as whole and the rest are transferred to the lower tiers.¹

1 *The Kashmir Times*, December 22, 1990.

Appendix XIV

FORGOTTEN FACTS OF KASHMIR SCENARIO

By Bansi Lal Kohistani

Gurudwara Mastawana Sahib near Sangrur of then Jind State, Sialkote Railway Station with Muslim League National Guards and journey via Suchetgarh some days before 15th August 1947 on one hand, Mujahid Manzil Srinagar with Maqbool Sherwani on the gate to check our membership cards of General Council of All Jammu and Kashmir National Conference in 1944 as well as Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah's directive of 26th November 1947 in connection with my emergency assignment, on the other, came to my mind just after reading all the Sixteen articles of Dr. Hari Om, Captioned 'Jammu-Kashmir-Ladakh-crisis and dialogue' published in *Daily Excelsior*, Jammu, from 1st November 1990 to 17th November 1990. It was only at Gurudwara Mastwana Sahib, forty three years ago, that very systematically lessons on the theory of Hindu Rashtra were imparted to us in one month Officers Training Course of Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS). Dr. Hari Om has very ably revived the same theory with just one addition in the words of Shri O.N. Dhar (*Hindustan Times*, 2nd October 1990—Kashmir illusions and reality) used to reply the author whose thesis has been upheld by Dr. Hari Om that "in order to present Jawahar Lal Nehru as the villain of the piece, readers have been induced to believe that just when the Indian Army was poised for the final thrust to victory, Nehru ordered a Ceasefire".

It is through the article of Shri O.N. Dhar that I knew about an article having been published in a Calcutta daily. Had I read that article by a retired senior officer of the Indian Army seeking to limit "the choice in Kashmir" to "either let

Kashmir go" and "reset our international border somewhere along a line north of Udhampur or fully absorb the State in the Indian mainstream in which case Article 370 must be repealed" etc. I would certainly sent him a telegraphic congratulation for at least somebody coming forward to tell truth, or showing the way to get rid of Kashmir phenomenon. But I agree with Shri O.N. Dhar, when he says : "Not only was the Army (then in 1947) not prepared to undertake a full-scale war against Pakistan, the Governments of India and J & K were not prepared to overstretch the country's limited resources at the time by occupying and holding down territories which would have resisted Indian occupation. In the course of the highest level political confabulations held on the subject at the time, the clear view that had emerged was that it would be disastrous in the long run even to seek to re-occupy and keep some parts of J & K like Poonch, Mirpur, Gilgit and Skardu where the Muslims had revolted just before partition and indicated a clear preference for Pakistan.

The State of Jammu and Kashmir around the time partition occurred did not, it has to be remembered, present a homogenous picture. While almost 90 per cent Muslims in the valley led by Sheikh Abdullah and National Conference were for India and against Pakistan, non-Kashmiri Muslims of Muzaffarabad, Poonch, Mirpur, Gilgit and Skardu were almost wholly set to accede to Pakistan. Hindus in the Jammu region and Buddhists in Ladakah were determined to be in India. The decision to have the ceasefire was thus dictated not only by strong strategic considerations but also by sagacious political perception.

I am not at all spokesman of National Conference or Congress(I), rather I agree with Dr. Hari Om that Ladakh, Kashmir and Jammu need to be separated from each other. But I differ with his thesis based on the assumption that Valley of Kashmir plus city of Jammu and town of Leh are the only components of the State of Jammu and Kashmir. Shri Mohammad Ayub Shabnam may be now behind bars, but his band, or Pahari Zilla action committee of Arnas-Mahore or

even insignificant Lander-Bamhag action committee sponsored and run by a young advocate of Udhampur have more clout than political organisations (who owe their existence to Radio Kashmir Jammu) mentioned by Dr. Hari Om and based in city of Jammu.

While Dr. Hari Om has summarily referred to 1983 Assembly elections (*Excelsior* 8th November 1990) or manipulated victory in elections (*Ex* 9th) but he has certainly missed to mention that turmoil of Kashmir is also due to non-involvement of people in development activity. It is upto 1953 that trio of Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah, Mirza Mohammad Afzal Beg and Pandit Kashyap Bandhu had harness the energy of people of Kashmir valley through the medium of hallasheri in construction of roads and raising of community plantations. Even after 1953 Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad had not only mobilised the people of Kashmir valley but also the populace of Jammu region including Kandi areas. But in his 5th article (*Excelsior* 5th November 1990) Dr. Hari Om has ordained that : "One of the significant aspects of Bakshi's politics was financial blackmail", while the Sheikh had resorted to "political blackmail". He advances quite convincing reason that money was brought from India "to keep the Kashmiri Muslims on right path". But I cannot contemplate as to how Dr. Sahib would have explained the scenario which I had seen during the visits of Bakshi Sahib from Basohli to Poonch. At Akhnour elite of the town had come to him to get school upgraded and I remember his announcement where Thakur Raj Singh was posted, he mobilised people and got school upgraded. At Pouni I introduced the Praja Parishad workers to him. Dinner was arranged and served by them. Durga Das of *Times of India* had accompanied him. Both had stayed in very ordinary Sarai. Foundation of Katra development was laid by Bakshi Sahib. While corruption still prevails even in Governor's rule some ten times more, there is no fraction of that impact which was there in Bakshi's time.

I find that Jaya Raina (*Hindustan Times*, 13th September 1990) has rather reconciled two opposite theories by saying

that "Soon after the euphoria of having led a successful people's movement under the auspices of National Conference, the wheel moved a full circle perhaps in the reverse direction after his dismissal in 1953".

It was during the political vacuum of these two decades from fifties to seventies that the bulk of present day militants were born. The insurgents in their teens and twenties are the product of chaotic times bereft of any ideological parameters in terms of politics and economics.

It is Indian brand of secularism and not Jawahar Lal Nehru, alone, that is somewhat responsible for the ultimate turmoil due to pampering of minorities. Mahatama Gandhi, too, can be blamed for utilising Muslims' Khilafat movement as an integral part of national struggle (Mr. Jinnah had then ridiculed the very basis of such support). Because whole theory of secularism was never fool-proof, in case of Kashmir we encouraged 'Kashmiriat', about which Jaya Raina observed as hereunder :

"The much talked about Assembly elections held in 1977 under the Janta Party rule were also held under a surcharged atmosphere of preserving the 'Kashmiriat' and also facilitating, is not accession with Pakistan, at least close collaboration with the populace on the other side of the border. The Pakistani rock-salt covered by a green handkerchief (green for Islam) was used by the top National Conference leaders from public platforms to garner vote.

An advocate from Kashmir had moved a resolution in the political conference called by late Sheikh Abdullah before resumption of office of Chief Minister in 1975 that word 'secularism' should be removed from political vocabulary. I had also been specially invited to attend this conference, which I could not. But I can say that had I done so, I would surely have seconded the motion.

Jawahar Lal Nehru was certainly a person of high ideals. He believed 100% in the philosophy of secularism and in the

words of Shri S.L. Sakhdar, former Chief Election Commissioner (spoken in the inaugural session of the two day international conference on the Kashmir crisis held on 21st and 22nd October 1990 at New Delhi) Jawahar Lal Nehru had said Kashmir was a concept, a place where the two-nation theory would be put to test and disproved again and again.

Shyama Prasad Mookerjee (who formed Jana Sangh on 21st October 1951) was rather more practical and realist when according to Dr. Hari Om (*Excelsior*, 2nd November 1990) he had suggested that "if Sheikh Abdullah insists upon a limited accession by Kashmir, then at any rate let us devise a scheme by which the people of Jammu and Ladakh may have full liberty whether they will or will not integrate fully (with India)."

Had this been done by declaring valley of Kashmir as a separate State (separate from Jammu and Ladakh) of India, perhaps 1953 upheaval would not have occurred. Kashmiri Pandits had already started migrating from Kashmir valley; people had swiftly started converting the grounds particularly belonging to Army and Private Departments of the State into Eidgahs and Auqaf Islamia property and in a State (of valley of Kashmir) which (eventually 99% of Muslim population) none could have objected to all this, or even declaration of Friday as holiday. Corruption and mismanagement would have created leftist opposition and ruling clique would not have been able to raise bogey of Hindu domination or of Jammu to divert and defuse such opposition. This could have solved some other problems, too. Those two lakh people from Sialkote and Shakargarh Tehsils of present Pakistan, who migrated in 1947 but still have not been granted citizenship (so that percentage of Hindu population does not increase even slightly) could have got that. Rather conclave of Niabat Narot Jaimal Singh of district Gurdaspur could have become natural part of district Kathua.

Dr. Hari Om, while discussing problems and suggesting solution in respect of Kashmir has altogether omitted the

factor of Kashmiri Pandits. If political leadership avoids to consider this factor, the philosophy of Secularism is available to them to let people believe that Kashmiri Pandits will certainly flock back to the valley. Shri Girilal Jain, former editor, while dispelling illusions had observed (at conference, 21st October, 1990) that "There was no reason to believe that it would be possible for Kashmiri Pandits to return (to the valley) in the foreseeable future."

Similarly Dr. Hari Om has equated whole of Jammu region with the city of Jammu. This is obvious from his mention of political organisations which just exist in Radio broadcasts and do not extend beyond the mohalla in which the sole trustee of each party resides. Whole region between Kishtwar and Poonch is Muslim majority area and right from Gajendra-gadkar Commission to this date we alongwith a number of activists have been suggesting that five autonomous districts of Kishtwar, Doda, Ramban (with which Tehsil Gool should go) Rajouri, Poonch should find place in any political settlement.

Dr. Hari Om has briefly referred to malpractices in elections, but it is Jai Raina who observed (*Hindustan Times*, 13th September 1990 Militancy in Kashmir as hereunder :

"Whereas rigged elections, corruption, administrative malpractices and negation of democratic rights to the populace in the valley have over the years provide fertile ground for the growth of terrorism, the failure of political leadership at the State level in mobilising people at various levels acted as the much needed fertiliser in the evolution of militancy in recent years."

Only some days back I wrote two articles with the caption : 'Exodus of harijans from Ghiala Anji'. Five years back I had written seven articles after extensively touring forty viilages of district Anantnag. Besides touching the issue of migration of more than half of harijan households of villages Ghiala and Anji Tehsil Reasi (where Gujjars are predominantly in habited) I had referred to a very new trend of withdrawl of

students from Government schools and same fervour of Deeni Taleem as it has initially started in valley of Kashmir. I had also referred to sheer wastage of twenty lakhs of rupees on the name of development schemes and demanded active participation of local people in execution of development. For this purpose it has been suggested that work of restoration of Ghiala Kuhl as well as preservation of Ghiala Rakh must be entrusted to the cooperative of beneficiaries.

In this connection a paragraph from one of these two articles is reproduced below :

“After touring forty villages of district Anantnag in 1985, I had summed up, then, as to how faulty execution of development schemes and irrelevant education system had led people to hate whatever was Indian and opt for Islami Darsgahs. From the condition of two Government Primary Schools at Anji and Ghiala and from the fervour of most of Gujjar families in handing over their children to the charge of Moulvies I can say that the drift in Ghiala Anji is quite on the same lines. I can also understand as to why the elite of Anji (all of whom happen to be Gujjar) has never expressed enthusiasm or keen desire for extention of road or preservation of forests. Rather they want to remain aloof, also in the hope that they and they alone (hardly any harijan has been allowed by them to share their encroachment on Government lands) would occupy all the land, Government, forest and other. When due to steep increase of population, destruction of forests and illiteracy they would feel impoverished, doctination by Moulvies will enable them to curse India for all the self-inflicted evils of poverty, illiteracy and backwardness.”

It was twenty four years back, in 1966, that committee on Democractic Decentralisation appointed by Government of Jammu & Kashmir after touring States of Andhra Pradesh, Gujrat and Rajasthan and also meeting extensively the panchas and people in different parts of the State of Jammu and Kashmir had quite sincerely (and with conviction) suggested, in their report, that effective and duly elected village Panch-

yats (at Patwar Halqa level) Block Panchayat Samities and District Development Boards should be established in this State also. Besides myself, Shri Abdul Aziz Zargar, Mr. Mukhtar of Bandipur, Mr. G.A. Mir, Ex Zaildar of Sallar, Shri Mangat Ram Sharma and Shri Jatendra Dev Happened to be members of the Committee.

I can certainly say that fact of avoiding people's participation in development schemes and bringing in of middlemen and sycophants to corner the benefits of Central Government generosity, alongwith bureaucracy has been major cause of turmoil in Kashmir.¹

1. *Excelsior* November 21, 1990.

Appendix XV

SOZ CASTIGATES JAGMOHAN

By Dr. Hari Om

Mr. Saif-Ud-Din Soz has withheld the truth from the nation and justified the on going militancy and terrorism in Kashmir. His long letter 'Jagmohan wrong' (The Times of India, May 1, 1991) and the insinuations it contains only serve to demonstrate his perfidiousness and the out-and-out unscrupulousness and the malevolent design of the Rajiv-Farooq nexus, always busy with power games having no regard for ethics, social service and national interest. Instead of answering the simple and straight but pertinent, crucial and fundamental questions Mr. Jagmohan's April 22, 1991, 21-page open letter to Mr. Rajiv Gandhi embodies, Mr. Soz simply sought to fix the entire responsibility on Mr. Jagmohan and vomit venom and blatant lies to castigate the former Governor.

Thus, according to Mr. Soz, till January 18 1990, the "terrorists had not...attempted to launch their movement" and that it was the "brutal crack-down in Maisuma and other parts of Srinagar...the night Mr. Jagmohan arrived in the State" which "gave the Kashmiri militants their movement".

Both these suggestions are fallacious having not even an iota of truth behind them. Mr. Soz must not forget that the current phase of secessionist militancy commenced with the cataclysmic Rajiv-Farooq truce of 1987, which made the National Conference forego its claim as the champion of the Kashmiri identity and aspirations, and the wholesale rigging of the 1987 Assembly elections which denied the Muslim United Front its due. It was the damage Dr. Abdullah, Mr. Soz and other Kashmiri leaders of their like have done to the democratic process and the forcible eviction of the Muslim United front activist, Mr. Aijaz Dar, from the Counting-Hall of the

Amirakadal Assembly constituency and his subsequent brutal killing outside the Hall to convert the sure defeat of the NC candidate into an unlawful victory, which set the stage for the rise of militancy and terrorism in the beautiful and peaceful Valley.

Mr. Soz's allegation that Mr. Jagmohan perpetrated oppression and atrocities on the Kashmiri Muslims the day he arrived in the State is nothing but a travesty of truth. It is now established beyond any doubt that it was not the dumb-founded Jagmohan but the forocious and desperate Dr. Farooq and his ragged caucus which had ordered the elimination of elements opposed to the corrupt, opportunistic and highly outrageous family rule of Sheikh Abdullah. That crack-down should happen the day Mr. Jagmohan reached Jammu was nothing more than an intrigue against the nation as also a diabolical plan hatched by the rather dangerous NC-Congress(I) combine as a premeditated move to tarnish Mr. Jagmohan's image in the estimation of the innocent, God-fearing and law-abiding Kashmiris who held him in high esteem during his first tenure as the Governor of the State.

Again, the insinuations that the situation in Kashmir was quite satisfactory and peaceful before January 18, 1990, and that Mr. Jagmohan organised the "exodus of Kashmiri Pandits" should be dismissed with the contempt they deserve. While making such insinuations and wild allegations against Mr. Jagmohan, Mr. Soz has apparently ignored (a) innumerable demonstrations the Kashmiri secessionists organised before Mr. Jagmohan took over as the State Governor to incite the people to acts of treason and violence; (b) the anti-India and pro-Pakistan slogans raised during those demonstrations; (c) observance of black days and black nights in Kashmir on such festive occasions as the Independence Day and the Republic Day and week-long civil curfews ordered by the secessionists; (d) the secessionists' plan of declaring Kashmir as an independent Islamic Republic on January 26, 1990, after capturing the Doordarshan and the Radio Kashmir, Srinagar; (e) the remark-

able role Mr. Jagmohan played in saving Kashmir for India by his timely action; (f) the reign of terror let loose by the militants and subversives and the parallel government that they ran before the imposition of curfew (official) and house-to-house combing operations to nab them and smash their net-work; (g) the bomb-blasts, the terrorists' attacks on the para-military forces, open defiance of the State authority and the kidnappings and brutal killings of peace-loving, nationalist and law-abiding people; (h) the closure of shops, cinemas, banks, industrial establishments and what not; (i) the atrocities alleged to have been committed by the fundamentalists and pro-Pakistan elements on the non-Muslims which include the Kashmiri Pandits, Punjabi Hindus, Sikhs and Dogras as also on the nationalist Muslims; (j) the unequivocal warning to the Kashmiri Pandits to leave the Valley within 48 hours or face physical liquidation; (k) the repeated requests of the then Governor, General K.V. Krishana Rao, to relieve him from the responsibility forthwith etc. etc. etc. All this happened under the very nose of Dr. Abdullah and before Mr. Jagmohan assumed the responsibility as the State Governor on January 18, 1990.

Far more amazing is Mr. Soz's silence over the release of the 70 hard core terrorists by Dr. Farooq and the armed training of the Kashmiri youth which has been going on since 1984. Further, Mr. Soz's silence over Dr. Abdullah's February 6, 1991, 100-minute luncheon chat (mostly on record) with the Delhi-based foreign correspondents wherein he admitted that "I (Dr. Abdullah) directed my partymen to lie low, go across the border to undergo armed training, do anything but do not get caught by Mr. Jagmohan" is deplorable and reprehensible indeed. Not only this. Mr. Soz's criminal silence over the boycott of the 1989 Lok Sabha elections by the Kashmiris is quite intriguing and a brazen attempt at hiding the truth. The condemnation of Mr. Jagmohan by Mr. Soz for the reason that the former has suggested the abrogation of the separatist Article 370 with a view to obtaining for Kashmir a politico-constitutional status similar to one that exists in the case of all other States of the Indian Union is misconceived and warrants out-

right condemnation. Dr. Abdullah, Mr. Soz and other Kashmiri leaders who are frantically seeking shelter in Delhi, Bombay and foreign lands instead of polity controverting the baneful and pernecious influence the on slaughter of the secessionists have created, would be well advised not to dub those who want the Kashmiris to enjoy fundamental rights enshrined in the Indian Constitution and shun their exclusiveness to join the mainstream politics, as fascist and parochial.

Last but not the least, Mr. Soz's view that "the Kashmir problem has to be resolved peacefully and bilaterally by India and Pakistan" is highly dangerous and can be construed as an act of treachery against the Indian nation. Mr. Soz has flatly refused to acknowledge the vital fact that the Valley belongs to India. What India wants back is the vast territory Pakistan occupied in 1947-48 with the full backing of Lord Mountbatten and Pandit Nehru who enforced a strict ceasefire before getting the Pakistan aggression in Kashmir vacated. To argue that in order to restore peace in Kashmir we must cultivate Pakistan is to accept the latter's claim over the former as also to agree to the secessionists' suggestion about holding of a plebiscite in the Jammu and Kashmir State under the UN Resolutions.

It must remain a matter of shame that a Member of Parliament (now Ex and would remain Ex for all the times to come) should be the spokesman of Pakistan. Only a government of the sort as the present one is or the one Mr. Rajiv Gandhi provided can overlook, rather encourage to woo Muslim votes, pro-Pakistan propaganda and anti-para-military and armed forces tirade unleashed from no other a place than New Delhi itself, the capital of sovereign India. Mr. Rajiv Gandhi is no record having castigated the para-military forces for the heroic role they are playing in Kashmir. Pity that the elements hostile to India are not only being allowed full freedom to preach secession of Kashmir from India and to pour venom on the nationalist forces in New Delhi itself, but also being pampered by the Delhi Durbar and being presented before the nation as redeemers and saviours. What could be more helpful to Pakistan than that the Delhi Durbar should allow anti-

India elements to plead the Pakistani cause and denounce the security forces whose only sin is that they are sacrificing their precious lives to protect the national cause in Kashmir, which has become a plague—spot due to the Rajiv-Farooq blunders.

Appendix XVI

"TRIFURCATE INDIA"

, *By Hari Om*

The Indian unity is under grave threat. The strategic Punjab and Kashmir are on the boil. Forces hostile to India have created a volcanic situation there. Murder and mayhem committed through terrorism, abduction and extortion and open attacks on the security forces and indoctrination of the Sikh and the Muslim youth through fundamentalist education have become the order of the day. With the weak-kneed policy reigning supreme, the administration in both Punjab and Kashmir is finding it extremely difficult to restore people's confidence in the state apparatus or to controvert and thwart the highly baneful and pernicious influence Pakistan has created in the sensitive border States by catching public fancy through a shrill-hate India campaign and the promise of Khalistan and 'Azad'. Certain human rights organizations have further damaged India's resolve in Kashmir and Punjab by bringing out one-sided pro-terrorists reports containing details of atrocities alleged to have been committed by the Indian security forces on what they call "innocent civilians". These reports have not only lowered the image of the security forces but have also bolstered the subversives, terrorists and secessionists to further render the State apparatus ineffective through terrorist violence and to coax the masses to an open revolt against India.

Another ignoble aspect of the situation is the unprecedented disinformation campaign Pakistan has unleashed through its print and electronic media and through foreign-based human rights associations and other anti-India lobbies with a view to corner India on the issue of human rights violation. The motive is very clear. And that is that Pakistan wants India to be trifurcated into India, the Sikh Khalistan and the Muslim Kashmir. One may or may not agree but it is a hard fact that Pakistan has succeeded

in enlisting an unstinted support of a number of leading persons having connections at right places to weaken India's case at international forums.

A number of reports against India have been published; a number of memorandams have been submitted to Mr. Perez De Cuellar, the UN Secretary General, to obtain his support against India and a number of conferences, seminars and workshops have been organized in the US and the UK to malign India in the eyes of the so-called civilized people. Pakistan is conducting campaign against India in a most meticulous way. The latest onslaught against India would be the International Kashmir Conference scheduled to be held in the US on July 12, 1991. The Conference is jointly sponsored by the London-based International Institute of Kashmir Studies (IICS) and the Harvard University. *Nawa-i-Waqt*, Pakistan) According to Dr Ayub Thakur, the all World Jammu and Kashmir Freedom Movement President and the Director Kashmir International Press, a large number of intellectuals and politicians from all over the world are expected to participate in the deliberations of the anti-India Conference. On the top of its agenda is "Kashmir and its right of self-determination". The other issue before the Conference would be "gross-violation of human rights in the Indian Occupied Kashmir".

It is difficult to say how exactly the event shapes itself but it may be possible to formulate a view in the light of the anti-India activities going on in the US and the UK calculated to seek "India's trifurcation". It is pertinent to mention here that certain anti-India lobbies, like the Kashmir American Council (KAC), the IICS, the Bureau of Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs of the State Department (BHRHA), and the Washington, D.C.—based Committee for Human Rights (CHR) are leaving no stone unturned for humbling the Indian nation on the question of human rights violation in Kashmir and Punjab as also for mustering the US-the UK-the UN support for the ongoing secessionist movements in Punjab and Kashmir. The just released 'Kashmir Reports' containing accounts of brutalities allegedly committed by the Indian State on the "free-

dom fighters" (The Kashmir Reports have been published by the KAC, Washington, D.C. and the IKS, London.); the May 1, 1991, the KAC Executive Director, Dr. Ghulam Nabi Fai's memorandum urging the UN Secretary General to order a plebiscite in Kashmir and the proceedings of the Second General Assembly of the KAC, held recently at Dayton, Ohio, and the Congressional Human Rights Caucus (CHRC) amply demonstrate a firm resolve on the part of the Indian adversaries to facilitate India's dismemberment. That the pro-trifurcation forces have succeeded in promoting their cause in the US and the UK is evident from the active support they have received from Mr. Arieti, Director BHRHA, Mr Wally Herger and Mr Don Burton, both Republicans and known adversaries of India, Rep. Tom Lantos (CA), Rep. John Porter, Rep. Faleomavega (D-Samoa), Rep. Nides, Government Programme Officer for Asian Affairs, Amnesty International, and others.

But it is just a tip of the iceberg. To have a full view of the conspiratorial activities going on in Pakistan, the US and the UK one has to go deep into a plethora of anti-India documents and proceedings of a number of human rights organizations and other bodies championing Pakistan's cause.

Painful

What is more painful from the standpoint of India is the very thick stick the former Prime Minister, Mr Rajiv Gandhi a former Union Minister, Mr. George Fernandes, and the President of the erstwhile Insaf Party, Syed Sahabuddin, have provided—may be inadvertently—to the pro-trifurcation forces to beat India with most severely. Mr, Gandhi's statement that the "Indian Armed forces have gone berserk in Kashmir", Mr. Fernandes's declaration on October 12, 1990, in a seminar at the Harvard University that the Kashmiri Muslims were not mistreating Kashmiri Hindus and that the former State Governor, Mr Jagmohan, "bribed Hindus into leaving Kashmir" as according to one Mr. K.L. Koul Mr. Jagmohan had allegedly told the Hindus that "he was planning to kill at least 150,000 Muslims in order to re-establish Indian control over Kashmir",

and Mr. Sahabuddin's October 15, 1990, accusation during his visit to Washington, D.C. that the "Indian Occupied Forces" and the "Indian Colonia Administration" have "ravaged" Kashmir have all been exploited to the full to make a very powerful case against India and to counter the Indian Government claims that there is minimum violation of human rights in Kashmir and that the human rights champions and secessionists have painted trivial incidents of everyday occurrence in lurid colours so as to inflame popular feelings and to defame India.

The fact of the matter is that such statements have emboldened the protagonists of the country's vivisection to heighten their ulterior propaganda against India. Those who have the opportunity of watching the Pakistani television and going through memoranda and reports on Kashmir know the use the pro-trifurcation elements have made of the statements of Mr. Gandhi, Mr. Fernandes and Mr. Sahabuddin.

Two things which are common in almost all the reports and memoranda submitted in the past and recently are the demands to the effect that the Indian Government be pressurised to grant permission to the Amnesty International to send its teams to Punjab and Kashmir for an on-the-spot study of the situation and that the UN Secretary General should order a plebiscite in Kashmir in accordance with the "international agreement between India and Pakistan brought about by the United Nations itself in 1948-49 and confirmed and endorsed by a number of resolutions of the security Council." The upshot of the argument is : "the time has come to knock down the wall, which hides the world's largest so-called democracy...and to give the people of Kashmir the right to determine their future, so that they can enjoy the same freedoms" the people enjoy in the United States.

India has nothing to hide, but that doesn't mean that it is open for scrutiny by the international human rights community. Mr. Rajiv Gandhi had once rightly remarked that "we are a democracy and the acts of omission and commission of the

government have to be scrutinized by the people's parliament and not by an inspector from a foreign land."

What will the international human rights teams do in Punjab and Kashmir? They will just lap up what the protagonists of Khalistan and 'Azadi' tell. They will convince the Amnesty teams that inhuman and medieval methods are being used by the security forces to eliminate "freedom fighters". They will convince that excesses, torture on prisoners and third degree methods are being applied to crush their genuine movement. They will help the Amnesty build up a thick anti-India file, which will provide an additional deadly weapon to the Indian foes. To shoot an armed insurgent in a gun battle or to interrogate the nabbed subversive is a heinous crime in the Amnesty International's dictionary. But the brutal gunning down of the former Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, in her own house by her own security guards lies beyond the purview of the Amnesty International. The inhuman killing of Mr. Rajiv Gandhi in a bomb blast near Madras is not enough to warrant Amnesty's wrath against the terrorists. In the Amnesty International's dictionary, a murder is nothing but the "torture" of the murderer is a highly outrageous and unforgivable crime. Thousands of innocent men, women and children have physically liquidated in a most barbarous fashion by the secessionists and subversives during the last about ten years. Bus loads of passengers, school children and common and innocent persons have been killed for the simple reason that they owed their allegiance to India. The entire community of Kashmiri Pandits have been hounded out of Kashmir by the protagonists of 'Azadi' and Pakistan. Did these people not suffer inhuman torture? No, no, the international Human rights community deals just with the State torture.

Will the human rights community appreciate the unlimited and unprecedented latitude the Indian Government has allowed to rebels, traitors, terrorists, secessionists and Pak infiltrators? Will the Amnesty condemn what happened at the Tiananmen Square in Peking or what is happening in Ireland and South Africa or for that matter in Sindhi, Punjab and Pak-Occuied-

Kashmir (Pakistan)? In any other State such acts of treason and subversion as have been committed and are still being committed in India would have warranted immediate trial by a military court and execution would have been the verdict. Such prompt action would have created a terror among the secessionists and the murderers, who want India to be trifurcated. But India is extremely kind and generous towards those advocating the promoting fissiparous tendencies.

The visit of the Amnesty International teams will simply make the confusion about the national sensitive issues worse confounded. The murderers and secessionists in and outside jails will supply to the Amnesty International teams enough grist for the anti-India mills having their base in the US, the UK and Canada as also to the Indian adversary Number one, Pakistan, so as to carry conviction with the Western World that India has been depriving the Sikhs and Kashmiri Muslims of their citizenship rights and that the Indian security forces are maintaining the Indian hold over Punjab and Kashmir by perpetrating worst kind of torture and oppression on those fighting for their political redemption.

The Amnesty's duty is not to inquire into the gigantic infiltration of the armed insurgents from across the border. It is also not its duty to know about the enormous stockpile of lethal arms and ammunition smuggled by the pro-trifurcation forces from Pakistan. It is also not within its ambit to go into the cases of murder and mayhem committed by those wanting India's vivisection. The Amnesty's law book doesn't permit the champions of human rights to recommend punishment to those who cut off the ear of one, savagely lash the other, mercilessly lynch a third and unmindfully kidnap and shoot down a fourth. It has the right to information about the human rights situation in Punjab and Kashmir but it has nothing to do with the problem of secessionism facing India.

Heed

It is obvious that some very dangerous moves are afoot to destabilize India. The Government of India must pay heed.

Now is the time for an act of statesmanship and to mark time is to lose Punjab and Kashmir. It must not only oppose arrival of the Amnesty International inspectors but must also counter effectively the disinformation campaign launched by Pakistan and such other anti-India mills through print and electronic media, through seminars and workshops and through international conferences. The July 12, 1991, International Kashmir Conference should be viewed seriously. As per the Pakistani television this Conference would be the first of its kind. ("Human Rights : Conspiracy Against India." *Daily Excelsior* June 17, 1991).

Index

- Abdullah, Farooq, 45, 48, 51, 82 ff, 97 ff, 157-58, 166
 Abdullah, Sheikh, 1 ff, 21, 61 ff, 72 ff, 78 ff, 92, 114 ff, 138, 140 ff, 156, 162, 177
 Act of 1892, 172
 Act of 1939, 1
 Advani, L. K., 34
 Amethi, 32
 Amritsar, 11; Treaty of, 172
 Anjuman-i-Islami, 19
 Arya Samaj, 3, 122
 Assam, 126
 Atiqullah, 16

 Baha-ud-Din, 3
 Bahawalpur, 51
 Bajpai, A. B., 34, 171
 Bakshi, G. M., 66ff, 115, 138
 Basu, Jyoti, 28
 Bhadarwah, 139
 B. J. P., 165, 169 off, 177
 Bhim Singh, 105
 Bhutto, Z. A., 89
 Bikaner, 51
 Bombay, 133

 Chandra Shekhar, 28, 39, 158
 Chitral, 172

 Dacca, 6
 Delhi, 27, 30, 35, 44, 58-9, 126, 131, 157, 167, 171
 Devi Lal, 27
 Dhar, D. P. 66, 70-1, 95
 Doda, 23, 139
 Dogras, 25ff
 Dogra, G. L., 70-1
 Dogra Mandal, 140 ff, 153
 Dogra, Prem Nath, 141

 England, 78
Excellsion, 130

 Farooqi, M., 27-8
 Fernandas, George, 28

 Gajendragadkar, 129ff
 Gandhi, Indira, 32, 92, 97ff 175
 Gandhi, Rajiv, 27, 81, 97
 Gilgit, 172
 Gulab Singh, 2, 10, 131, 172
 Gupta, P. C., 130

 Hari Singh, Maharaja, 1, 15, 131
Hindu, The, 44
 Hunza, 172
 Hyderabad, 50

 Indian National Congress, 171
 Ireland, 160
 Iskoman, 172

 Jafar Khan, 16
 Jain, Girilal, 26, 34-5
 Jammu People Front, 176
 Jammu Praja Parishad, 132, 176
 Jamwal, A. S., 130

Janata Dal, 26, 37, 75, 160

JULP, 69-71

Jinnah, M. A; 47, 93

Jodhpur, 51

Kapur, M. L., 130

Karan Singh, 44, 48, 67

Kargil, 155

Kashmir Times, 130

Khilafat, 9, 20

Kishatwar, 139

Kud, 71

Ladakh, 24, 28 ff, 38 ff, 49 ff, 64 ff,
96, 101 ff, 116, 127, 129 ff,
150 ff, 157 ff, 165, 169 ff, 177-78

Lahore, 9, 58

Leh, 155

Liaquat Ali Khan, 50

London, 27, 78

Madhok, Balraj, 37, 39, 44, 62

Mahajan, M. C., 49, 114

Mangat, D. S., 161

Menon, V. P., 45, 49

Mohani, Hasrat, 57

Mookerjee, S. P., 45, 55, 63, 104,
141

Mountbatten, Lord, 50, 57-8

Nanda, G. L., 61

National Conference, 75, 82 ff, 94 ff

Nehru, Jawaharlal, 44, 47, 51, 54,
63, 65, 97 ff, 142

Pakistan, 32, 35ff, 51, 87, 93, 145,
153, 162

Patel, Sardar, 59

Panthers Party, 176

Poonch, 23, 139, 166

Praja Sabha, 1-2

Pratap Singh, 3, 8, 18, 131

Punjab, 160-61

Qasim, Mir, 70, 74, 156

'Quit Kashmir' Movement, 23

Rajouri, 23, 135, 139, 166

Ranbir Singh, 131

Reading, Lord, 2-4, 8

Rebiro, J., 161

Sadiq, G.M., 66, 70-71, 94-96, 115,
132, 156

Sahni, K.N., 27, 35, 170

Saxena, G.C., 158ff

Shah, G.M., 117, 134, 156

Shahbuddin, 39

Shams-ud-Din, 115, 132

Shiv Sena, 122, 159

Shourie, Arun, 26, 34

Sikri Commission, 177

Singh, V.P., 26

Soz, Saif-ud-Din, 27

Srinagar, 50, 135, 167, 171

Surjeet, H.S., 28, 39

Syed, Mufti Mohammad, 160

Tarkunde, V.M., 31-32

Times of India, *The*, 160

Tyabji, Badr-ud-Din, 133

Udhampur, 135

United Nations, 47, 49, 92

University of Jammu, 155

Venketeshran, A.P., 26, 34

Wood, J.B., 10

Yasin, 172

Zia-ul-Haq, 89ff

ERRATA

<i>Page</i>	<i>Line</i>	<i>Printed</i>	<i>Read as</i>
v	2	dirturbed	disturbed
vi	1	on	one
2	1	would	mould
9	26	demoriaized	demoralised
9	37	in attention	neglect
10	23	trivil	trivial
11	24	on	one
16	7	Shah-Ud-Din	Shad-Ud-Din
17	6	instance	instances
17	23	on	no
17	31	committed	committee
18	24	was all the	was all the
18	35	campain	more
19	15	fact	campaign
19	24	civization	fat
20	11	resolutiyins	civilization
21	11	one hand	resolutions
21	31	religios	one hand and
22	13	hated	religious
23	8	every walk	hatred
23	10	waich	every walk of
23	15	rapidly	life.
23	21	or	which
23	23	affair	rebidly
24	6	excelssior	of
26	12	giving	affairs
28	31	voilation	Excelsior
30	7	general	give
33	20	horrowing	violation
36	31	sutilized	central
37	25	anambiguous	harrowing
37	28	basis	utilized
38	2	opins	unambiguous
38	3	be	oasis
39	1	has	opines
39	14	differences	by
			his
			difference

<i>Page</i>	<i>Line</i>	<i>Printed</i>	<i>Read as</i>
40	8	exist	exit
45	32	Kashmiris	Kashmiris
46	22	Shikhs	Sikhs
47	1	eulogizing	eulogizing
48	7	1980	1989
53	3	hands	hands of
53	12	comouflaging	comouflaging
54	34	face	fate
55	5	muslim	muslims'
56	36	amaging	amazing
57	21	sadily	sadly
59	19	she	the
62	20	1952	1951
64	33	dissatisfaction	dissatisfaction
65	24	assession	accession
68	1	to mess	the mess
68	12	aggrandise	grind
69	20—33	JKLF	JKPF
70	1	JKLF	JKPF
71	7	released	release
71	13	unfaithfully	unfaithful
72	2	resoin	rejoin
78	18	supreme	supremo
83	17	India	India's
85	16	polite	police
88	9	defient	defiant
92	18	29	23
93	3	the	they
93	13	once	one
93	29	on	or
95	10	concluse	conclude
96	21	or	of
99	19	to scot-free	to go scot free
101	26	ovbiously	obviously
103	5	olong	along
103	27	dissatment	dissatisfaction
105	1	giver	given
106	16	ashmiris	Kashmiris
114	21	on	an
116	2	of	to
117	18	people	people of
118	33	demandd	demand
122	8	getting	is getting
125	17	in with	in

<i>Page</i>	<i>Line</i>	<i>Printed</i>	<i>Read as</i>
127	11	fall	fail
130	30	slogan to	slogan of
132	4	diteching	ditching
132	8	cummulative	cumulative
132	31	these	those
133	5	Jammuited	Jammuites
135	1	goal	goal of joining the mainstream politics was obviously res- ponsible for
141	18	friction	fruition
141	20	not	not do
141	25	rabic	rabid
143	5	Kashmir	Kashmir and
148	10	and immediate	an immediate
150	11	occure	occur
152	13	none	done
152	17	in had	in hand
152	26	what	whet
153	1	autonomy	autonomy to
154	6	on	one
157	17	on foot	afoot
158	1	government	governor
158	15	only	only suggested
158	18	at	as
164	11	one per	of one per
165	22	abondoning	abandoning
167	6	of the which	of which
168	5	2	3
169	5	waat	what
170	12	top renking	top-ranking
175	17	for	from
178	12	action the	action be
178	14	as the	at the
178	15	hell	held
179	4	to the of said	of the said
180	6	areas also	areas is also
180	11	thought	though
181	3	quarely	squarely
181	23	Laqakhis	Ladakhis
181	23	hops	hope
181	26	thought	though
183	heading	Statement	Settlement

<i>Page</i>	<i>Line</i>	<i>Printed</i>	<i>Read as</i>
183	3	Krshmiri	Kashmiri
183	25	whith	with
183	26	mallify to	mollify the
184	22	sactity	sanctity
186	18	demur	without demur
187	35	and	had
189	6	suvbersives	subversives
201	18	constaining	containing
202	9	non-muslime	non-muslims
203	6	ssme	same
207	11	to the her	to toe her
210	13	conributory	contributory
217	26	asked cf	asked to
218	1	A.R.Noorani	A.G.Noorani
219	10	erperts	experts
221	21	or	of
222	19	a befree	a free
261	10	forocious	ferocious
263	3	polity	politically
263	29	no	on
265	13	compaign	campaign
265	25	ane	and
267	5	n	in
268	3	colonia	colonial
268	35	comission	commission
270	2	committee	committed

ANMOL PUBLICATIONS

4378/4B, Ansari Road, Murari Lal Street,
New Delhi - 110002
Phone : 326159.